arXiv:hep-ph/9412244v1 6 Dec 1994

Light-Front Dynamics and Light-Front QCD [1]

Wei-Min Zhang
Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica,
Taipei, Taiwan 115, R.O.C.
(Received July 12, 1994)
(Published in Chinese J. Phys. **32**, 717 (1994))

In this article we review the basic formulation of light-front field theory and light-front phenomena in strong interaction. We also explore various approaches to the understanding of these phenomena and the associated problems of hadronic bound states based on QCD (quantum chromodynamics) on the light-front.

PACS. 11.10.Ef – Lagrangian and Hamiltonian approach.
PACS. 11.10.Gh – Renormalization.
PACS. 11.10. St – Bound state problems.

I. INTRODUCTION: A HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF LIGHT-FRONT DYNAMICS AND SOME COMMENTS

In this article, I will try to address some aspects of nonperturbative QCD. The theory of nonperturbative QCD (at the hadronic scale) has indeed not been well defined at the present time. Firstly, how much we can understand about the real theory of the strong interaction from the canonical QCD structure is totally unknown. Secondly, there are in the literature many models or effective theories that are inspired by QCD, and yet they cannot be derived directly from QCD, although they are more or less successful in describing hadronic phenomenology. Undoubtedly, to discuss the problems of nonperturbative QCD is not a simple task. Yet the fact that little progress has been made for the past twenty years on the study of nonperturbative QCD (i.e., the explicit solution of the dynamics of quarks and gluons in the strong coupling regions) may force us to think about whether one is able to extend the traditional approach of the perturbative field theory to the description of a strong coupling theory. The covariant perturbative framework lacks the simple Schrödinger

[1] Based on the lectures presented in "the Second Workshop on Particle Physics Phenomenology", May 19-21, 1994, Kenting, Taiwan.

© 1994 THE PHYSICAL SOCIETY
OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

picture of quantum mechanics, which may be the obstacle to further development of a nonperturbative covariant framework. In this article I am going to introduce a "new" dynamical framework, namely *light-front dynamics*, which can overcome the above obstacle and has many advantages for exploring nonperturbative field theory[2] that may point to a new direction in the investigation of the relativistic dynamics of the strong interaction and nonperturbative QCD in the future.

In field theory textbooks *light-front dynamics* may not be a familiar term for most of us. However, this topic is actually not new at all. In every step of the development of strong interaction theory light-front dynamics has indeed played a crucial, if not the essential, role for our understanding of hadronic physics. Therefore, before I list the main problems that I will discuss in this paper, I would like to give a brief review of the historical development of light-front dynamics and the role it played in the study of the strong interaction and QCD over the past forty-five years since its invention. However, I must emphasize that all I discuss in this article is only a part of the problems in the strong interaction and in light-front dynamics that currently interests me. A complete description of the theory of the strong interaction and the light-front field theory is certainly beyond my knowledge. If the reader is interested in this topic, he or she may find a relatively complete list of references in [1].

Light-front dynamics, simply speaking, is a description of the evolution of a relativistic system along a light-front direction.

The light-front time-space variables, defined as $x^{\pm} = t \pm x$ where x is one of the three components of the space variables, were indeed invented a long time ago, even before the birth of modern physics. They have been widely used in solving various problems in mathematical physics for the last hundred years. A typical example that one might remember from an undergraduate course is how to solve the wave equation (for simplicity, we only consider one-time and one-space variable for illustration here):

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - v^2\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right)\Psi(t,x) = 0\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where v is the velocity which is a constant. It is well-known that, to solve the above equation, it is most convenient to introduce the new variables: $\xi = t + x/v$ and $\eta = t - x/v$. With these variables, the wave equation is reduced to $(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\xi\partial\eta})\Psi = 0$ and its solution must have the form $\Psi(t,x) = f(t + x/v) + g(t - x/v)$. Physically, this solution indicates that the system moves along the line $t = \pm x/v$ with the velocity v in the $t - x$ space. The light-front variables $x^{\pm}$ correspond to the case where the velocity $v = c$ (the speed of light) with the unis $c = 1$. In such a case, we say that the system moves on the null-plane.

[2]One may note that this framework also has many disadvantages compared to the traditional covariant framework if we apply it to perturbation theory, as we will see later.

The physical implication of the use of the light-front coordinates can indeed be manifested from the solution of the above wave equation. First, we consider a small v (compared to the speed of light) in Eq. (1.1) which, physically, corresponds to nonrelativistic dynamics. In this situation, the system moves along the line $x = \mp vt$ which does not deviate from the line $x = 0$ very much (see Fig. 1a). As a result, it may be convenient to describe the evolution of the system in terms of the usual time variable t as the time direction. Such a choice of the time direction is the one people are most familiar with because this is the world we live in now. However, if $v \sim c$ (corresponding to relativistic dynamics), the system indeed moves near the line $x^+ = t + x = 0$ or $x^- = t - x = 0$ in the $t - x$ plane (see Fig. 1b). In this case, if we still use the variable t as the time direction along which the system evolves, the phenomena we measure in laboratories must behave very differently from the picture of nonrelativistic dynamics that we intuitively think about. Yet, if we choose a new "time" direction, namely in terms of the light-front variable x^+ (or x^-), structurally the time evolution of a relativistic system may look very similar to a nonrelativistic system in the ordinary time-space coordinate system. Consequently, with the light-front variables, relativistic dynamics may become simple and transparent.

Forty-five years ago Dirac first introduced the concept of the light-front form for relativistic dynamics, which he called the front form. He defined it as follows: the three-dimensional surface in space-time formed by a plane wave front advancing with the velocity of light, for example $x^+ = t+x^3 = 0$, is called a *front*, where x^3 is the third component in the three-dimensional space. For a dynamical theory, a form of dynamics which is associated with the sub-group of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group that leaves the front invariant may appropriately be called the *front form* [2]. The front form is now commonly called the light-front framework or simply the light-front. In the literature, it is sometimes also called the null-plane.

Dirac's attempt to introduce the light-front form was to look for the most convenient Hamiltonian formulation for a relativistic system. A relativistic system is required to satisfy

FIG. 1. The illustration of light-front dynamics.

two principles: it is invariant under infinitesimal inhomogeneous Lorentz transformations and it is a Hamiltonian system. The first requirement arises from the relativistic principle and the second is given by quantum mechanics. Then a dynamical system is characterized by the ten generators, $P^\mu, M^{\mu\nu}$, of the Poincare group, which are determined by the Hamilton equations (Heisenberg equations in quantum mechanics). Based on this philosophy, Dirac found that there are three possible forms for relativistic dynamics: i). The instant form of dynamics: the dynamical variables referring to physical conditions at some instant of time.[3] In this case the subgroup that leaves an instant invariant are the translations and rotations while the dynamics is determined by P^0 and the boost operators M^{0i}. According to Dirac, the instant form has the advantage of being the one people are most familiar with, and, that is all. ii). The point form of dynamics: a form of dynamics associated with the subgroup of the inhomogeneous Lorentz transformations that leaves a point, say the origin $x_\mu = 0$, invariant. In this case, the homogeneous Lorentz transformation is simple (kinematic) but all the four-vector momenta P^μ are dynamically dependent. The advantage of the point form is perhaps the dynamical separation between P^μ and $M^{\mu\nu}$. iii). The front form of dynamics that has been defined in the previous paragraph. The front form has the advantage that of the ten generators of the Lorentz group, only three (instead of four in the other forms) are dynamically dependent (as we will discuss later in detail). Furthermore, there is no square root for the Hamiltonian, which might simplify the dynamical structure since a square root relation between the energy and the momentum cannot provide a simple picture of the bound state Schrödinger equation.

At the time Dirac proposed the light-front Hamiltonian dynamics modern quantum

[3] An instant is a flat three-dimensional surface containing only directions which lie outside the light-front for example, $t = 0$.

field theory underwent a revolutionary change, namely a covariant perturbative field theory was established [3-5]. This formally beautiful and practically useful theory has been used so successfully in the description of all the known physical phenomena in quantum electrodynamics (QED). At that time, Dirac's ideas about the front form of relativistic dynamics were completely ignored. This should not surprise us because, if we can formulate and compute everything in a covariant form, we never need to dynamically solve the Poincare algebra. This was perhaps the main reason why the above mentioned ideas of Dirac have not recieved enough attention since their invention. Feynman's covariant formulation has dominated the investigation of field theory for the past forty-five years. Undoubtedly it has so many advantages for our understanding of the microscopic processes with such a novel picture and provides a tremendous simplification of the practical computations. However, one might recall, that, since it was invented covariant field theory has achieved little progress for nonperturbative theory, specially for the relativistic bound state problem. More precisely speaking, the quantum field theory we use today may be better to be explicitly called the perturbative field theory. Nonperturbative theory requires a complete description of the whole physical state space. Yet, in the covariant form, in order to keep the covariance, one has to work in a state space that is much bigger than the original physical state space. This makes the nonperturbative picture physically unclear and computationally much more complicated within the framework of the covariant form.

Note that, even for perturbation theory, the covariant formalism involves too many unphysical processes in practical computations in order to keep its covariant form. A typical example from the early days of field theory is the Z-graph (see Fig. 2) which occurs in the amplitude of various fermion scattering processes. This diagram contains a state that violates the Pauli principle that cannot be explicitly excluded in a covariant calculation. In principle, the contribution of this unphysical state is cancelled by the contribution of the same unphysical state involved in the vacuum diagram which is, however, factorized out in the calculation. In order to avoid such subtle problems, Weinberg developed a new formulation for perturbative field theory in the infinite momentum frame in 1966 [7], which is equivalent to the field theory quantized on the light-front.[4] In the infinite momentum (as well as in the light-front) perturbation theory, all diagrams that involve particle production from the vacuum must vanish, thereby the Z-graphs are automatically excluded.[5]

In fact, the development of perturbative field theory in the infinite momentum frame given by Weinberg was motivated very much by the works of Fubini and Furlan [8] and by Dashen and Gell-Mann [9] on the so-called fixed mass sum rules derived from current

[4]It must be pointed out that the infinite momentum frame itself is not the same as the light-front. The former is a special Lorentz frame while the later is a coordinate system of space-time in which all Lorentz frames, from the rest frame to the infinite momentum frame, can be described.

[5]Strictly speaking, this statement is only conditionally true which we will discuss later.

algebras. From the current algebras of the vector and axial vector currents, one can easily derive many sum rules for various current matrix elements that can be measured in experiments. However, in an arbitrary frame, these sum rules may mix the space-like and time-like processes and depend on the intermediate state energies so that the momentum transfer in these matrix elements in the sum rules varies term by term. As a result, these sum rules are difficult to be used to test theory with experiments. Fubini and Furlan found that if one boosts the target into the infinite momentum frame, the above difficulty is solved and the sum rules are reduced to those with a fixed momentum transfer (q^2), namely the fixed-mass sum rules.

FIG. 2. The Z-diagram.

Meanwhile, the sum rules become very useful if they are approximately satisfied by some set of single particle and resonant intermediate states that provide us with a large number of algebraic relations among coupling constants and form factors. In the infinite momentum frame the nonzero matrix elements of currents should span an $SU(6)$ representation, as was noticed by Dashen and Gell-Mann [9]. Thus, the main contribution to the sum rules comes mostly from the single particles and resonance hadronic states that are classified by the $SU(6)$ spectrum generating algebra (the current quark model).

After the above early application to the study of the strong interaction, the most exciting progress made for light-front dynamics was perhaps the parton phenomena observed in deep inelastic scattering in the very late 60's. The parton picture, as everyone knows, was introduced by Feynman [10,11] for interpreting the scaling behavior discovered by Bjorken [12] from the deep inelastic scattering experiments. Although most of us will immediately think of the partonic picture in the infinite momentum frame, when we talk about parton phenomena, it is in fact much easier to see its theoretical underpinning on the light-front. The cross section for deep inelastic scattering is proportional to the so-called hadronic tensor which is a Fourier transformation of the hadronic matrix element of the commutator of two currents:

$$W^{\mu\nu}(P,q) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d^4x e^{-iqx}\langle PS|[j^\mu(x), j^\nu(0)]|PS\rangle\,. \tag{1.2}$$

In the rest (Lab) frame with high energy and high momentum transfer where the transfer

momentum is assumed to be along the z-direction, it is easy to check that the dominant contribution in the above integral comes from the region $x^+ = t + z \sim 0$. In other words, in high momentum processes, the main contribution to the hadronic tensor comes from the light-front commutator of two currents. On the other hand, causality, $x^2 = x^+x^- - x_\perp^2 \geq 0$, shows that the light-front commutator is not vanishing only if $x_\perp = 0$. Obviously the commutator of the two currents on the light-front can only depend on x^-, the light-front longitudinal variable, from which one can easily derive the Bjorken scaling that the structure functions extracted from the hadronic tensor are independent of the hadronic mass scale. Gross and Treiman further proved that the dominant contribution to the hadronic tensor is from the most singular part of the light-front commutators which is mainly given by the free theory [13]. This provides a theoretical foundation for Feynman's parton model. Therefore one usually refers to the parton phenomena the light-cone dynamic of the strong interaction.

The manifestation of light-front dynamics from the parton picture in deep inelastic scattering led to many attempts to reformulate field theory on the light-front in the very early 70's. Typical works are by Drell, Levy and Yan [14-16] and by Bjorken, Kogut and Soper [17], who attempt to derive the parton structure directly from field theory [18]. Meanwhile, Chang and Ma began to study the canonical structure of field theory on the light-front [19]; Leutwyler *et al.* attempted to develop a light-front quantization approach to field theory [20]; Kogut and Soper reformulated QED on the light-front [21]; Rohrlich *et al.* explored the relation of the initial value problem with boundary conditions on the light-front for QED [22,23], and Chang and Yan extensively discussed various field theories quantized on the light-front using Schwinger's action principle and compared the light-front noncovariant perturbative structure to the traditional covariant formulation [24-27]. Also there were many other concerns in the light-front field theory at that time (for examples, see [28,29]). These investigations provide a basis for conventional canonical light-front field theory. However, the nonperturbative aspects of field theory on the light-front had not been addressed at that time.

On the other hand, the parton phenomena also led to further extensive exploration of current algebras on the light-front and the associated sum rules. For example, the fixed-mass sum rules in the infinite momentum frame can be easily and naturally obtained from the light-front current algebras, which were provided by Jackiw and his collaborators [30,31]. It was also found that with the light-front current algebras some anomaly structures, such as Schwinger terms, may be easy to address [32,27]. The most important development for strong interaction along this line is the development of a fundamental theory for the strongly interacting basic constituents (quarks and gluons), i.e., QCD. Now everybody believes that QCD is the only acceptable fundamental theory for the strong interaction, but maybe not

everyone knows that QCD was initially formulated by Gell-Mann and Fretsch [35] *on the light-front*. At the time many particle theorists focused on the field theory interpretation of the parton phenomena, Gell-Mann and many others still concentrated on looking for a possible fundamental theory for the quark model which is very successful in the description of the classification of hadronic states. In the current quark model, an essential equation to determine the dynamics of the model is the quark equation of motion on the light-front. Gell-Mann and Fretszh wrote down the quark equation of motion exactly, based on $SU(3)$ gauge theory on the light-front with the light-front gauge, in their paper of 1972.

Of course, QCD is accepted as the fundamental theory of strong interactions due mainly to the discovery of its asymptotic freedom behavior by Gross and Wilczek and by Politzer [36,37], which provides the theoretical basis for the parton phenomena in high energy physics. Asymptotic freedom allows us to use perturbation theory to do a QCD calculation for physical processes near the light cone $x^2 \sim 0$ (the common statement that perturbative QCD is for short distance dynamics is indeed a misleading comment). Obviously, the natural framework for exploring the parton phenomena with QCD is the formulation of QCD on the light-front with the light-front gauge. The remarkable properties of the light-front formulation are that the conventional vector and axial vector currents of quarks remain gauge invariant in QCD, and the concept of parton distribution functions naturally occurs [38].

The development of a light-front formulation for QCD is as follows. Tomboulis first quantized Yang-Mills theory on the light-front in 1973 [39]. Cornwell and Crewther discussed possible singularites arising from the choice of light-front gauge [40,41]. The first QCD calculation with the light-front gauge was given by Gross and Wilczek in 1974 [42], who used it to check the gauge dependence of the one-loop anomalous dimension and the β function. The canonical quantization of QCD on the light-front was provided by Casher [43] and by Bardeen *et al.* [44,45] in 1976. Thorn addressed the problems of asymptotic freedom and the confinement mechanism within light-front QCD in the late 70's [46]. Lepage and Brodsky developed the Hamiltonian formulation of light-front QCD and explored the asymptotic behavior of hadrons and the perturbation expansion of various exclusive processes [47-49]. Franke *et al.* first addressed the problem of light-front gauge fixing and the associated nontrivial QCD structures [50]. Głazek discussed the quark condensate in light-front QCD [51]. Meanwhile, due to the scaling evolution of the hadronic structure functions suggested by Altarelli and Parisi [52], a systematic development of the factorization theorem for various inclusive processes and a practical calculation scheme of the various anomalous dimensions within light-front QCD were also provided in the early 80's [53-55]. Note that the factorization theorem for deep inelastic scattering was initially proven by the use of operator product expansions which are only valid near the light-cone

[56]. In the mid 80's, there were also a lot of discussions about the trouble caused by the light-front gauge singularity and its possible solutions in perturbation theory [57-60]. In conclusion, due to the light-cone behavior of high energy dynamics, perturbative light-front QCD, as the foundation of the parton picture, has been widely used in various investigations of high energy processes.

Here I shall make some comments. Because of the two conventional requirements of field theory, namely, covariance and unitarity, the development of non-abelian gauge theory with gauge fixing is not at all simple. In the usual covariant path integral quantization, the unphysical gauge components violate unitarity and therefore one has to introduce ghost fields to cancel the unphysical states in the theory [61]. A covariant formalism has several advantages for many aspects, yet the physical picture becomes obscure once unphysical particles are introduced. On the other hand, in canonical quantization one has to choose a physical gauge, such as the axial gauge or light-front gauge, where unitarity is automatically satisfied but covariance is no longer manifest. Although we know that the natural picture of QCD for parton phenomena is based on the light-front gauge, many still prefer to use the covariant formulation. The main complaint against the light-front gauge is that the usual prescription (principal value prescription) for the gauge singularity prohibits any continuation to Euclidean space (Wick rotation) and hence power counting for Feynman loop integrals. As a result, non-local counterterms have to be introduced, which break the multiplicative renormalizability [41,59].

However, even in covariant perturbation theory, formal multiplicative renormalizability may not be significantly useful in the calculation of hard scattering coefficients. This is because gauge invariant composite operators in the operator product expansion are not multiplicatively renormalizable [62], and the gauge variant operators will induce gauge invariant counterterms that do contribute to gauge invariant matrix elements. Although it was believed that the mixing problem had been solved [63], the long-standing discrepancy between the covariant and light-front gauge calculations for the second-order anomalous dimension of the gluon composite operators has recently renewed attention to the renormalizability of QCD [64,65]. In fact, the mixing of gauge invariant operators is an intrinsic property that exists in any covariant formulation of QCD. The above mixing problem of gauge invariant operators apparently disappears in the physical gauges and perturbative calculations become straightforward. However, a new spurious mixing of ultraviolet and infrared divergences associated with the gauge singularity does occur in the light-front gauge using the principal value prescription. One has to be careful to see whether or not the spurious mixing affects physical quantities. In the light-front gauge, it has been shown that the most severe infrared divergences caused by the $A_a^+ = 0$ gauge choice with the principal value prescription are indeed cancelled in the gauge invariant sectors [53]. Thus, in the

perturbation region, the light-front gauge singularity in QCD may not be a severe problem.

Although QCD manifests asymptotic freedom, the main feature of QCD as the fundamental theory of the strong interaction should lie in its nonperturbative behavior. In the past twenty years, there has been tremendous work on nonperturbative QCD, and some nontrivial structures, such as the instanton [66], were revealed. Unfortunately, the real picture of nonperturbative QCD that leads to quark confinement and chiral symmetry breaking, which are believed to be the two essential mechanisms for form hadron formation from QCD, is still lacking. Roughly speaking, all methods that we use today for exploring nonperturbative QCD were mainly developed by Wilson in the late 60's and the early 70's. These are the lattice gauge theory [67], operator product expansions [56] and the renormalization group approach [68,69]. The lattice gauge theory is the only computable approach in the market for the nonperturbative study of QCD. In the past one and a half decades, extensive work on lattice gauge theory has led to significant progress in many research avenues; however, accurate information on the bound state of light quarks is still not available [70]. On the other hand, a phenomenological approach of nonperturbative QCD, namely QCD sum rule [71], has become a reliable approach for various hadronic structures. The theoretical basis of QCD sum rule is the operator product expansion which separates the perturbative and nonperturbative contributions of QCD in hadrons near the light-cone. In fact, what one has learned from QCD sum rules about QCD is nothing more than the perturbative part of QCD. The nonperturbative aspect in QCD sum rules is still purely phenomenological, including the parameterization of the quark and gluon condensate (which must be directly calculated from QCD for a full understanding of nonperturbative QCD but so far no one knows how to compute them).

Succinctly speaking, the aim of nonperturbative QCD is to find the hadronic bound states directly from QCD. However, the only truly successful approach to bound states in field theory has been Quantum Electrodynamics (QED), with its combination of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics to handle bound states and perturbation theory to handle relativistic effects [72-75]. Lattice Gauge Theory is maturing but has yet to rival QED's comprehensive success. There are three barriers which prohibit an approach to Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) that is analogous to QED. They are: (1) the unlimited growth of the running coupling constant g in the infrared region, which invalidates perturbation theory; (2) confinement, which requires potentials that diverge at long distances as opposed to the Coulombic potentials of perturbation theory; (3) spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking, which does not occur in perturbation theory. The last two barriers are essentially related to the nonperturbative structure of the QCD vacuum.

In contrast to the gloomy picture of the strong interaction in QCD, however, is that of the Constituent Quark Model (CQM), the most successful model in the description of

hadronic dynamics. In CQM, only a minimum number of constituents required by the symmetries is used to build each hadron [76]. Moreover, Zweig's rule leaves little role for the production of extra constituents [77]. Instead, the rearrangement of pre-existing constituents dominates the physics [78-80]. Yet the CQM has never been reconciled with QCD — not even qualitatively. Note though that QCD was initially proposed on the light-front in order to develop a fundamental theory for the quark model [35]. In 1989, Wilson suggested that QCD on the light-front may provide a natural framework to solve QCD nonperturbatively for hadrons because the use of the light-front coordinates may allow us to develop the same techniques that solve QED for solving the physics of CQM [81]. To do so, he proposed a new idea for constructing the low-energy QCD theory for hadrons based on light-front power counting which differs from what we are familiar with in the equal-time framework. Combined with the two-component formulation of the light-front QCD [82] and a new scheme for Hamiltonian renormalization [83,84], it seems to provide a newer avenue for exploring nonperturbative QCD dynamics and hadrons than that used for solving QED. This has been presented in a recent paper by Wilson, Walhout, Harindranath, Zhang, Perry, and Glazek [85].

At this moment, I cannot predict whether this new approach will give the final solution for QCD or whether this approach will be successful for a strong coupling theory. Light-front dynamics may shorten the distance from our hopes for QCD to a real picture of the hadronic world. What I can comment on is that in the past twenty years various phenomenological understandings of nonperturbative QCD, such as the constituent quark model for the heavy quark system, the heavy quark symmetry for the heavy-light quark system and the effective chiral theory for the light quark system, could guide us in the right direction. Optimistically, we should believe that any new attempt inspired by a successful understanding of phenomenology always contains a possibility of providing a real answer to the unsolved problems.

After this long historical overview of the development of light-front dynamics and light-front QCD in terms of my personal point of view, I now give an outline of this review. In the next section, I will present a brief description of the basic structure of the light-front form and the free field theory on the light-front. Then in Sec. III, I will discuss the light-front phenomena from which I hope a picture is provided of what we really need to understand from QCD on the light-front for strong interaction phenomena, i.e. the light-front bound states for hadrons. In Sec. IV, I will discuss the general structure of light-front bound states and their advantages in describing hadronic physics, and some phenomenological light-front wave functions for hadrons that have been used for successfully describing many hadronic properties. In Sec. V, as a basis for exploring the light-front dynamics of QCD, canonical light-front QCD and its various properties and problems are

discussed. In Secs. VI and VII, I will introduce new ideas that were originally proposed by Wilson and his collaborators for finding light-front QCD bound states for the hadrons, and I will also discuss possible practical schemes to realize these ideas and thereby to provide a possible real theory of QCD for hadrons.

II. LIGHT-FRONT FORM

II-1. Lorentz Transformations on the Light-Front

One of the useful properties in light-front formulation of relativistic dynamics is its convenient Lorentz transformation structure [2]. In this section, we shall introduce some basic properties of the Lorentz transformation on the light-front.

The light-front coordinates of space-time $(+,-,-,-)$ are defined as

$$x^{\pm} = x^0 \pm x^3\,, \qquad x^i_\perp = x^i\,, \qquad (i=1,2)\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where we choose x^+ as the "time" direction along which the system evolves. Thus x^- and $x_\perp$ naturally become the longitudinal and transverse coordinates. All other 4-vectors in space-time are defined in the same form as Eq. (2.1). The inner product of any two four-vectors is given by $a_\mu b^\mu = \frac{1}{2}(a^+b^- + a^-b^+) - a_\perp \cdot b_\perp$, where the metric tensor for Eq. (2.1) is $g^{+-} = g^{-+} = 1/2$, $g^{ij} = -\delta^{ij}$ and the other components are zero. The light-front time and space derivatives are $\partial^- = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial x^+}$, $\partial^+ = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial x^-}$, $\partial^i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ (see the definition of the metric tensor), and the four-dimensional volume element $d^4x = \frac{1}{2}dx^+dx^-d^2x_\perp$.

1. Poincaré algebra. A relativistic dynamical system must be Lorentz invariant. The inhomogeneous Lorentz transformation is generated by the Poincaré algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} &[P^\mu, P^\nu] = 0, \quad [M^{\mu\nu}, P^\rho] = i(-g^{\mu\rho}P^\nu + g^{\nu\rho}P^\mu)\,, \\ &[M^{\mu\nu}, M^{\rho\sigma}] = i(-g^{\mu\rho}M^{\nu\sigma} + g^{\nu\rho}M^{\mu\sigma} - g^{\mu\sigma}M^{\rho\nu} + g^{\nu\sigma}M^{\rho\mu})\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where P^μ is the four-vector momentum, and $M^{\mu\nu}$ describes the rotational and boost transformations. In the instant form, the rotational and boost operators are given as $M^{ij} = \epsilon_{ijk}J^k$ and $M^{0i} = K^i$, respectively, with

$$[J^i, J^j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}J^k\,, \quad [J^i, K^j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}K^k\,, \quad [K^i, K^j] = -i\epsilon_{ijk}K^k\,. \tag{2.3}$$

In field theory these generators are constructed from the energy momentum density $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$. For a given Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\phi_i)$, the energy-momentum tensor in the instant form is defined by[6]

$$\Theta^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_i)}\partial^\nu \phi_i - g^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

[6]If $\mathcal{L}$ contains gauge fields, we must add to $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ an additional term $\partial_\rho(F^{\mu\rho}A^\nu)$ to ensure that it is gauge invariant, symmetric and traceless.

Then,

$$P^\mu = \int d^3x\Theta^{0\mu}\,, \quad M^{\mu\nu} = \int d^3x[x^\mu\Theta^{0\nu} - x^\nu\Theta^{0\mu}]\,. \tag{2.5}$$

In light-front coordinates, the four-vector momentum operators and the boost and rotational operators are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} P^\pm &= P^0 \pm P^3\,, \quad P^i_\perp = P^i \quad (i=1,2)\,, \\ E^1 &= K^1 + J^2\,, \quad E^2 = K^2 - J^1\,, \quad K^3\,, \\ F^1 &= K^1 - J^2\,, \quad F^2 = K^2 + J^1\,, \quad J^3\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

In terms of the energy-momentum density, $K^3 = -\frac{1}{2}M^{+-}$, $E^i = M^{+i}$ and $J^3 = M^{12}$, $F^i = M^{-i}$, where

$$P^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\int dx^- d^2x_\perp \Theta^{+\mu}\,, \quad M^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\int dx^- d^2x_\perp[x^\mu\Theta^{+\nu} - x^\nu\Theta^{+\mu}]\,. \tag{2.7}$$

Physically, the light-front transverse boost (E^i) is a combination of a pure Lorentz boost and a usual rotation, and so is the light-front transverse rotation (F^i).

2. Boost transformation. The most useful property of the Lorentz transformation on the light-front is the kinematics of its boost transformation. The subgroup that leaves the light-front $x^+ = 0$ invariant is the translations (P^+, P^1, P^2) and the Lorentz transformations generated by J^3, K^3, E^i. A boost transformation,

$$L(\beta) = \exp\{-i\beta_i E^i\}\exp\{-i\beta_3 K^3\}\,, \tag{2.8}$$

transforms the light-front momenta operator as follows:

$$L(\beta)P^+L^{-1}(\beta) = P^+e^{\beta_3}\,, \qquad L(\beta)P_\perp L^{-1}(\beta) = P_\perp + P^+\beta_\perp e^{\beta_3}\,. \tag{2.9}$$

Consider a state in the rest frame: $|P\rangle$, where $P = (M,0,0,0)$ in the usual instant coordinates. The light-front momentum $P^+ = M$, $P_\perp = 0$. Let the transformation parameters be $\beta_\perp = p_\perp/p^+$, $\beta_3 = \ln(p^+/M)$, then we have

$$L(p)|P\rangle = |P'\rangle\,, \qquad P'^+ = p^+,\ P'_\perp = p_\perp\,, \tag{2.10}$$

which boosts the state in the rest frame to the frame with momentum $P' = p$. The boost for a state with an arbitrary momentum A is given by

$$L(P)|A\rangle = |A'\rangle\,, \qquad A'^+ = (P^+/M)A^+\,; \qquad A'_\perp = A_\perp + (A^+/M)P_\perp\,. \tag{2.11}$$

The remaining three generators of the Poincare algebra do not keep the light-front plane invariant. The operator P^- transforms the plane $x^+ = 0$ to the plane $x^+ = \tau$ while F^i rotates the plane $x^+ = 0$ around the surface of the light-cone $x^2 = 0$. In other words,

once we specify the initial data on the light-front $x^+ = 0$, the three operators, P^- and F^i, determine the evolution of the system away from $x^+ = 0$. Obviously, $x^+ = \tau$ is the evolution parameter, namely the light-front time variable.

II-2. Basic Formulation of Light-Front Field Theory

In this section we discuss some basic light-front structures in the field theory by looking at the canonical light-front quantization for a free scalar, a free fermion and a free gauge theory. The motivation is to show how light-front field theory differs from instant field theory.

1. Scalar field. Consider a free scalar field theory,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - m^2 \phi^2)\,, \tag{2.12}$$

the equation of motion on the light-front is given by

$$(\partial^- \partial^+ - \partial_\perp^2 + m^2)\phi = 0\,. \tag{2.13}$$

The light-front canonical theory can be obtained by defining the conjugate momentum of ϕ referred to the light-front time x^+:

$$\pi_\phi(x) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^- \phi)} = \frac{1}{2}\partial^+ \phi(x)\,. \tag{2.14}$$

It is worth noting that π_ϕ is not a light-front time derivative of ϕ, which implies that the light-front conjugate momentum is not an independent dynamical degree of freedom. The equal light-front time canonical commutation relation is then given by[7]

$$[\phi(x), \pi_\phi(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = i\frac{1}{2}\delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\,. \tag{2.15}$$

If we define

$$\left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right) f(x^-) = \frac{1}{4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- \epsilon(x^- - x'^-) f(x'^-)\,, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\epsilon(x) = 1, 0, -1$ for $x > 0, = 0, < 0$, then

$$[\phi(x), \phi(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = -\frac{i}{4}\epsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\,. \tag{2.17}$$

[7]Since the conjugate momentum is not an independent dynamical degree of freedom, the light-front dynamical system is always a constrained Hamiltonian system for which the naive canonical quantization is generally not valid, and one should use the Dirac quantization procedure [86]. However, here the con-straints can simply be solved so that the naive canonical approach, or more generally the phase space quantization approach is good enough to provide the basic commutation relations without any loss of the generality [87,88].

The light-front Hamiltonian of the free scalar field is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{LF} = P^- &= \int dx^- d^2x_\perp (\pi_\phi \partial^- \phi - \mathcal{L}) \\ &= \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \frac{1}{2}((\partial_\perp \phi)^2 + m^2\phi^2)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

A solution of the free scalar field on the light-front in terms of momentum space is

$$\phi(x) = \int \frac{dk^+ d^2k_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3[k^+]}[a(k)e^{-ikx} + a^\dagger(k)e^{ikx}]\,, \qquad k^+ \geq 0\,, \tag{2.19}$$

with the commutation relation:

$$[a(k), a^\dagger(k')] = 2(2\pi)^3 k^+ \delta(k^+ - k'^+)\delta^2(k_\perp - k'_\perp)\,. \tag{2.20}$$

In momentum space the light-front Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_{LF} = \int \frac{dk^+ d^2k_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3[k^+]} \frac{k_\perp^2 + m^2}{[k^+]} a^\dagger(k)a(k)\,, \qquad k^+ \geq 0\,, \tag{2.21}$$

where an infinite zero-point energy has been ignored. Thus, the light-front energy k^- for the scalar physical state $|k\rangle = a^\dagger(k)|0\rangle$ is

$$H_{LF}|k\rangle = k^-|k\rangle \longrightarrow k^- = \frac{k_\perp^2 + m^2}{[k^+]}\,. \tag{2.22}$$

This is the light-front energy dispersion relation, a result of $k^2 = k^+k^- - k_\perp^2 = m^2$.

The motivation for presenting such a detailed discussion of the free scalar theory here is to show the difference between the light-front field theory and the instant field theory. There are three major differences we can see from the above discussion. i) On the light-front, the canonical conjugate momentum is not a dynamical degree of freedom. In other words, the number of the dynamical degrees of freedom is reduced by half compared to the instant formulation. As a result, the scalar field variables themselves do not commute with each other on the equal light-front time plane (see Eq. (2.17)). ii) The energy dispersion relation does not involve a square root structure which may help us to formulate the relativistic bound states in terms of a simple nonrelativistic-like Schrödinger picture. iii) There is a new singularity in the light-front formulation which exists even in the free theory and which is hidden in the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$. In momentum space it corresponds to the singularity at $k^+ = 0$ in the form $\frac{1}{k^+}$. As we have mentioned in the introduction and as we will discuss later in detail the $k^+ = 0$ singularity is the most difficult problem to handle in the light-front field theories but it also plays an essential role in determining the nontrivial structure of the theory on the light-front. The definition of Eq. (2.16) is to remove this singularity. The notation $\frac{1}{[k^+]}$ denotes the Fourier transformation of Eq. (2.16):

$$\frac{1}{[k^+]} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{k^+ + i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{k^+ - i\epsilon}\right], \tag{2.23}$$

which corresponds to a principle value prescription. Since Eq. (2.16) is an integral it allows an arbitrary constant in defining the operator $1/\partial^+$. Different definitions of $1/\partial^+$ can lead to different commutation relations of Eq. (2.17) and different prescriptions for $\frac{1}{k^+}$. However, Eq. (2.16) has two advantages: it uniquely determines the initial and boundary conditions for the light-front field formulation [22], and it explicitly eliminates the $k^+ = 0$ modes from the theory [88]. The latter property plays an important role in simplifying the vacuum structure for light-front bound states. We shall come back to address these properties in Sec. V where we shall discuss them in nonabelian gauge theory. Keeping these differences in mind, we now discuss the fermion field formulation on the light-front.

2. Fermion field. For a free massive fermionic field with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ the symmetric Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{\psi}(i\gamma\cdot \overleftrightarrow{\partial} - m)\psi\,, \tag{2.24}$$

which leads to the Dirac equation

$$(i\gamma\cdot\partial - m)\psi = 0\,, \qquad \overline{\psi}(i\gamma\cdot\partial + m) = 0\,. \tag{2.25}$$

In the canonical procedure the light-front conjugate momentum of ψ and $\psi^\dagger$ are defined by

$$\pi_\psi = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^-\psi)} = i\frac{1}{4}\overline{\psi}\gamma^+\,, \qquad \pi_{\psi^\dagger} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^-\psi^\dagger)} = -i\frac{1}{4}\gamma^0\gamma^+\psi\,, \tag{2.26}$$

where $\gamma^\pm = \gamma^0 \pm \gamma^3$. From the above expression, we see that if we define

$$\psi_\pm = \Lambda_\pm\psi\,, \qquad \Lambda_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^\pm\,, \tag{2.27}$$

where $\Lambda_\pm$ are the light-front fermionic projectors: $\Lambda_+^2 = \Lambda_+$, $\Lambda_-^2 = \Lambda_-$, $\Lambda_+\Lambda_- = 0$, then we have $\psi = \psi_+ + \psi_-$ and $\pi_\psi = \frac{i}{2}\psi_+^\dagger$, $\pi_{\psi^\dagger} = -\frac{i}{2}\psi_+$. In other words, the fermion field on the light-front can be divided into the up (+) and down (−) components, while the canonical conjugate momentum of ψ only relates to the up component.

The most interesting property for the light-front fermion field is that the Dirac equation becomes two coupled equations:

$$i\partial^-\psi_+ = (i\alpha_\perp\cdot\partial_\perp + \beta m)\psi_-\,, \tag{2.28}$$

$$i\partial^+\psi_- = (i\alpha_\perp\cdot\partial_\perp + \beta m)\psi_+\,. \tag{2.29}$$

The equation of motion for ψ_- turns out to be a constraint equation since it does not contain any light-front time derivative. Using the definition of Eq. (2.16), we can express ψ_- in terms of ψ_+ and then substitute it into the equation of motion for ψ_+, obtaining

$$i\partial^-\psi_+(x) = \frac{1}{i4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^-\epsilon(x^- - x'^-)(-\partial_\perp^2 + m^2)\psi_+(x^+, x'^-, x_\perp)\,. \tag{2.30}$$

or

$$(\partial^+\partial^- - \partial_\perp^2 + m^2)\psi_+ = 0\,. \tag{2.31}$$

If we introduce the following γ matrix representation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma^i = \begin{bmatrix} -i\sigma^i & 0 \\ 0 & i\sigma^i \end{bmatrix}, \\
&\gamma^5 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^3 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sigma^3 \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

then

$$\Lambda_+ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.33}$$

the Dirac spinor is reduced to

$$\psi = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ \upsilon \end{bmatrix}, \quad \psi_+ = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \psi_- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \upsilon \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{\partial^+}(\sigma_\perp\partial_\perp + m)\varphi \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.34}$$

In other words, the fermion field on the light-front can be expressed by a two-component spinor φ which satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation, and all γ matrices can be reduced to the Pauli matrix. The relativistic fermion particle can then be described in terms of a nonrelativistic spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particle on the light-front. This is a very useful property of the fermion field on the light-front. The canonical commutation relation can be simply obtained,

$$[\varphi(x), \varphi^\dagger(y')]_{x^+=y^+} = \delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\,. \tag{2.35}$$

It must be emphasized that the above two-component light-front field still describes relativistic spin-1/2 particles, which are intrinsically different from spin-1/2 non-relativistic particles. In other words, it contains quarks and antiquarks. To see how antiquarks can be described in a two-component representation, we need to construct the charge conjugate for φ. By using the condition $C\gamma^{\mu T}C^{-1} = -\gamma^\mu$, it is easy to find that the charge conjugation operator in the γ-representation of Eq. (2.32) is

$$C = i\gamma^3\gamma^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i\sigma^1 \\ i\sigma^1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.36}$$

Hence,

$$\psi^c = \eta C\gamma^0\psi^* \longrightarrow \varphi^c = \eta\sigma^1\varphi^*\,, \tag{2.37}$$

where η is a phase factor which will be set to unity in this paper. Eq. (2.37) determines the definition of fermion and antifermion in a two-component representation on the light-front.

The light-front Hamiltonian of the free fermion field is given by

$$H_{LF} = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp (\pi_\psi \partial^- \psi - \mathcal{L}) = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \varphi^\dagger \frac{(-\partial_\perp^2 + m^2)}{i\partial^+} \varphi \,. \tag{2.38}$$

The solution of the free fermion equation of motion is

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_\lambda \chi_\lambda \int \frac{dp^+ d^2p_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3} [b(p,\lambda) e^{-ipx} + d^\dagger(p,-\lambda) e^{ipx}] \,, \quad p^+ \geq 0 \,, \tag{2.39}$$

where $\chi_{1/2} = \binom{1}{0}$, $\chi_{-1/2} = \binom{0}{1}$ are the spin eigenstates, and the fermionic and antifermionic annihilation and creation operators satisfy the following commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned} [b(p,\lambda), b^\dagger(p',\lambda')] &= [d(p,\lambda), d^\dagger(p',\lambda')] \\ &= 2(2\pi)^3 \delta_{\lambda,\lambda'} \delta(p^+ - p'^+) \delta^2(p_\perp - p'_\perp) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

In momentum space, the light-front Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{LF} = \sum_\lambda \int \frac{dp^+ d^2p_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3} \frac{p_\perp^2 + m^2}{[p^+]} [b^\dagger(p,\lambda) b(p,\lambda) + d^\dagger(p,\lambda) d(p,\lambda)] \,, \\ p^+ \geq 0 \,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

where again an infinite zero-point energy has been ignored. Thus, the light-front energy p^- for a fermion physical state $|p,\lambda\rangle = b^\dagger(p,\lambda)|0\rangle$ is

$$H_{LF}|p,\lambda\rangle = p^-|p,\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow p^- = \frac{p_\perp^2 + m^2}{p^+} \,. \tag{2.42}$$

The same result can be obtained for the antifermions. This is the light-front energy dispersion relation for the fermion field which is the same as that for the scalar field.

3. Gauge field. In the last part of this section, we consider a free gauge field:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \,, \qquad F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \,. \tag{2.43}$$

The light-front canonical momentum of A^μ is defined by

$$E^\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^- A_\mu)} = -\frac{1}{2} F^{+\mu} \,. \tag{2.44}$$

It immediately shows that $E^+ = 0$, which implies that A^- is not a physically independent field variable. With these canonical conjugate momenta, the equations of motion, $\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = 0$, are reduced to the light-front Maxwell's equations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ E^- - \partial_\perp \cdot E_\perp = 0 \,, \quad \partial^- E^- = \partial^1 B^2 - \partial^2 B^1 \,, \\ &\partial^- E^1 = \frac{1}{2}\partial^+ B^2 + \partial^2 B^- \,, \quad \partial^- E^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ B^1 - \partial^1 B^- \,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

where $\vec{E} = (E^-, E^1, E^2)$, and $\vec{B} = (B^- = F^{12}, B^1 = F^{2-}, B^2 = F^{-1})$.

Gauge invariance allows us to choose a special gauge. The most convenient gauge choice in light-front gauge theory is the light-front gauge

$$A^+ = A^0 + A^3 = 0\,. \tag{2.46}$$

With this gauge, the canonical momentum is reduced to $E^- = -\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ A^-$, $E^i = -\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ A^i$. Thus the first light-front Maxwell equation (Gauss Law) turns out to be a constraint equation,

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ A^- = \partial^i A^i\,, \tag{2.47}$$

from which the A^- component can be explicitly determined in terms of the physical (transverse) gauge field. Therefore, a gauge theory on the light-front can be expressed explicitly with the physical gauge field A^i:

$$H_{LF} = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \frac{1}{2}(\partial^i A^j_\perp)^2\,. \tag{2.48}$$

The canonical commutation relation for the physical gauge field is the same as that of the scalar field:

$$[A^i(x), A^j(y')]_{x^+=y^+} = -\frac{i}{4}\delta_{ij}\epsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\,. \tag{2.49}$$

The solution of the free light-front gauge field in momentum space is

$$A^i(x) = \sum_\lambda \int \frac{dq^+ d^2q_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3[q^+]}[\epsilon^i_\lambda a(q,\lambda)e^{-iqx} + h.c]\,, \quad q^+ \geq 0\,, \tag{2.50}$$

where ϵ^i_λ is the gauge field polarization vector: $\epsilon^i_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1,i)$, $\epsilon^i_{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1,-i)$, and the canonical commutation relation for vector boson annihilation and creation operators is:

$$[a(q,\lambda), a^\dagger(q',\lambda')] = 2(2\pi)^3 q^+ \delta_{\lambda,\lambda'}\delta(q^+ - q'^+)\delta^2(q_\perp - q'_\perp)\,. \tag{2.51}$$

In momentum space the light-front Hamiltonian has the same structure as the other fields,

$$H_{LF} = \sum_\lambda \int \frac{dq^+ d^2q_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3}\frac{q^2_\perp}{[q^+]}a^\dagger(q,\lambda)a(q,\lambda)\,, \quad q^+ \geq 0\,. \tag{2.52}$$

The light-front energy q^- for the physical gauge state $|q,\lambda\rangle = b^\dagger(q,\lambda)|0\rangle$ is then

$$H_{LF}|q,\lambda\rangle = q^-|q,\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow q^- = \frac{q^2_\perp}{q^+}\,. \tag{2.53}$$

Namely, $q^2 = 0$.

It may be worth noting that there is a remarkable property of the light-front free field theory discussed in this section: both fermion and gauge fields are reduced to a two-component representation. Later we will see that this is still true even for QCD. In QCD, since the gauge fixing $A_a^+ = 0$ removes the unphysical degrees of freedom, unitarity is automatically satisfied and no ghost field is needed, the price to pay being the loss of manifest covariance. The choice of the $A_a^+ = 0$ gauge promises that QCD involves only two-component gauge fields and two-component quark fields in light-front coordinates. In early stages of the development of light-front QED, Bjorken, Kogut and Soper used the two-component formulation to discuss various physical QED processes [17]. In the middle-80's a two-component Feynman perturbation theory with the Mandelstam-Leibbrandt prescription [57,58] was developed by Capper *et al.* [59] and Lee *et al.* [60] for pure Yang-Mills theory. It has been shown that there are many advantages in such a two-component light-front field theory. The extension of the two-component theory to the study of light-front canonical quantization (i.e. x^+-ordered theory) of QCD has been explored just recently [82]. Practically, one will see that the two-component formulation indeed provides a transparent physical picture. In order to understand clearly the origin of light-front singularities in various physical processes and to simplify practical calculations, all discussions in this article are based on the two-component formulation.

With the above basic formulation of the light-front field theory, we now discuss physical phenomena of the strong interaction on the light-front.

III. LIGHT-FRONT PHENOMENA

It has been well-known as early as the 60's that the partially conserved axial current (PCAC) provides the dominatant theoretical underpinning for the strong interaction. Although QCD has now been commonly accepted as the fundamental strong interaction theory, we are still unable to solve hadronic structures from QCD in the low-energy scale due to the lack of a practically computable nonperturbative approach for field theory. In the past three decades, most hadronic structures at low-energy can only be extracted from various phenomenological matrix elements of the currents in the hadronic bound states and the sum rules that these matrix elements satisfy by the use of current algebras. In other words, after about thirty years of investigation of the strong interaction for quarks, it may still be true that of all the theoretical methods which have been invented to describe hadrons, only the algebra of conserved and partially conserved quark currents has led to *precise connections* between the underlying fundamental degrees of freedom and the observed hadron properties. Typical examples are: i), the low-energy theorem for hadrons developed from current algebras in the middle of the 60's which underlies almost all of the theoretical understanding of the low-energy strong interaction; ii), the parton dynamics for

the deep inelastic scattering invented in the late 60's which has dominated the study of high-energy hadronic physics in the last two and a half decades; and iii), the QCD sum rules of the quark current correlations for meson and baryon structures investigated in the 80's, which are currently a main approach of the phenomenological nonperturbative QCD descriptions for hadrons. In fact, it is particularly of interest to see that the connections between the fundamental degrees of freedom and hadronic observables via currents are naturally manifested when we use light-front coordinates. Furthermore, the most important feature of the above connection in the light-front coordinates is that it directly addresses the fundamental interactions between the underlying degrees of freedom (quarks and gluons) in terms of physical observables that may further provide an alternative but more transparent approach to the study of nonperturbative QCD dynamics for hadrons. We will discuss this feature later. In this section I will review some phenomenological descriptions of strong interaction on the light-front.

III-1. Fixed-mass Sum Rules and Light-Front Current Algebra

The earliest application of light-front dynamics to strong interaction phenomena is the derivation of fixed-mass sum rules from current algebra in the infinite momentum frame. An introductory discussion can be found in the famous book by Adler and Dashen [89]. Without any loss of generality, let us consider the matrix element of the equal-time commutator of two vector currents sandwiched between the spin-averaged hadronic states:

$$\langle\beta(\mathbf{p})|[J_+(\mathbf{q}), J_-(-\mathbf{q})]|\beta(\mathbf{p})\rangle = 2\langle\beta(\mathbf{p})|J_3|\beta(\mathbf{p})\rangle\,, \tag{3.1}$$

where $(+,-,3)$ denote the isospin algebra indices, $J_a(q) = \int d^3x e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{x}} J_a^0(x)$ and

$$[J_+^0(x), J_+^0(y)]_{x^0=y^0} = 2J_3^0(x)\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The sum rule can be obtained by inserting a complete set of intermediate states $\{|n\rangle\}$ into the left-hand side of Eq. (3.1):

$$(2\pi)^3 \sum_n (|\langle\beta(\mathbf{p})|J_+^0(0)|n\rangle|^2 - |\langle\beta(\mathbf{p})|J_-^0(0)|n\rangle|^2)\delta^3(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{p_n}) = 4p^0 I_3(\beta)\,, \tag{3.3}$$

where the momentum transfer $q^2 = (p-p_n)^2$. The difficulty with the above sum rules is that q^2 depends on the energies of the intermediate states. These matrix elements can be measured or estimated from PCAC for certain values of q^2, while in the sum over states q^2 increases without limit as the mass of $|n\rangle$ increases. There is no obvious condition for the convergence of this summation. Consequently, its applicability is not clear since, in practice, one has to truncate the sum over states.

The difficulty can actually be removed if we boost the hadronic states to the infinite momentum frame, as was first discovered by Fubini and Furlan [8]. In the infinite mo-

mentum frame, $|\mathbf{p}| \to \infty$. Also, for simplification, it is convenient to impose the condition $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0$. Then

$$q^0 = (\sqrt{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2 + m_n^2} - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m_\beta^2}\,)^2 \stackrel{|\mathbf{p}|\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\,, \tag{3.4}$$

so that q^2 becomes independent of the mass of the intermediate state and is fixed: $q^2 = -\mathbf{q}^2$. All matrix elements in the sum rule have then a fixed momentum transfer. This leads to the so-called fixed-mass sum rule,

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_2(\nu, q^2 = -\mathbf{q}^2) = 4I_3(\beta)\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\nu = p \cdot q$, and W_2 is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\mu\nu}(p,q) &= (2\pi)^3 \sum_n \langle\beta(\mathbf{p})|J_+^\mu(0)|n\rangle\langle n|J_-^\nu(0)|\beta(\mathbf{p})\rangle\delta^3(p+q-p_n) \\ &= -g^{\mu\nu}W_1 + p^\mu p^\nu W_2 + q^\mu q^\nu W_3 + \frac{1}{2}(p^\mu q^\nu + p^\nu q^\mu)W_4 \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

in which W_i are the structure functions measured in experiments. This is perhaps the first application of the infinite momentum frame to the strong interaction phenomena.[8]

However, one may note that in deriving the fixed-mass sum rule, one has in fact used the assumption that it is legal to take the limit inside the integral. The validity of the above assumption is questionable due to the possible illegitimate interchange of limit and integral. It was shown that the fixed mass sum rules are equivalent to the appropriate light-front commutators and to the $|\mathbf{p}| \to \infty$ technique [90,91]. One can derive the various fixed mass sum rules from the light-front commutators without using the unreliable $|\mathbf{p}| \to \infty$ [31].

The light-front current algebra was given by Cornwell and Jackiw [30] based on the basic commutation relation for the light-front fermionic field: $\{\psi_+(x), \psi_+^\dagger(y)\} = \delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)$. For the $SU(3)$ currents, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [V_a^+(x), V_b^+(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = {} & if_{abc}V_c^+(x)\delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp) \\ & -\frac{i}{4}\delta_{ab}\partial_x^+\partial_y^+[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)S]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

[8]The above fixed-mass sum rules can also be obtained in the framework of a dispersive formalism with an unsubtracted assumption [89].

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[V_a^+(x), V_b^-(y)]_{x^+=y^+} \\
&\quad = if_{abc}V_c^-(x)\delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp) \\
&\qquad -\frac{1}{4}(if_{abc}+d_{abc})\{\partial_x^+[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)V_c^-(x|y)] \\
&\qquad -\frac{1}{2}\partial_x^i[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)(V_c^i(x|y) + i\varepsilon^{ij}A_{jc}(x|y)]\} \\
&\qquad +\left\{\frac{i}{16}[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^+\gamma^-\Lambda_{ab}\psi(y) - h.c.\right\} \\
&\qquad +\frac{i}{8}\delta_{ab}\partial_x^i\partial_x^i[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)S]\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.8}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[V_a^+(x), V_b^i(y)]_{x^+=y^+} \\
&\quad = if_{abc}V_c^i(x)\delta(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp) \\
&\qquad -\frac{1}{8}(if_{abc}+d_{abc})\{\partial_x^+[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)(V_c^i(x|y) - i\varepsilon^{ij}A_{jc}(x|y))] \\
&\qquad +\partial_{xj}[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)(-\delta^{ij}V_c^i(x|y) + i\varepsilon^{ij}A_c^+(x|y))]\} \\
&\qquad +\left\{\frac{i}{16}[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^+\gamma^i\Lambda_{ab}\psi(y) - h.c.\right\} \\
&\qquad +\frac{i}{4}\delta_{ab}\partial_x^+\partial_x^i\partial_y^i[\varepsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)S]\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.9}
$$

where V_a^μ is the usual $SU(3)$ vector current:

$$
V_a^\mu(x) = \overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\frac{1}{2}\lambda_a\psi(x)\,, \tag{3.10}
$$

and $V_a^\mu(x|y)$ and $A_a^\mu(x|y)$ are the bilocal generalization of the vector and axial vector currents:

$$
V_a^\mu(x|y) = \overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\frac{1}{2}\lambda_a\psi(y)\,, \tag{3.11}
$$

$$
A_a^\mu(x|y) = \overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\frac{1}{2}\lambda_a\psi(y)\,, \tag{3.12}
$$

with the internal symmetry matrices that satisfy the relation $\lambda_a\lambda_b = (if_{abc} + d_{abc})\lambda_c$.

The fixed mass sum rules based on light-front current algebra are now derived from the tensor

$$
C_{ab}^{\mu\nu}(p,q) = \int d^4x e^{ipx}\langle ps|[V_a^\mu(x), V_b^\nu(0)]|ps\rangle\,. \tag{3.13}
$$

The time reversal invariance, Lorentz invariance, parity conservation and current conservation allow us to rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ab}^{\mu\nu}(p,q) = & \left(-g^{\mu\nu}+\frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{q^2}\right)W_L^{ab} \\ & +\left(p^\mu p^\nu-\frac{\nu}{q^2}(p^\mu q^\nu+p^\nu q^\mu)+g^{\mu\nu}\frac{\nu^2}{q^2}\right)W_2^{ab} \\ & +i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}s_\alpha q_\beta W_3^{ab}+i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}p_\alpha q_\beta q\cdot s W_4^{ab}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

By setting $q^+=0$ and integrating over q^- for the $+\nu$ components of $C_{ab}^{\mu\nu}$ [31], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\left(\frac{\nu}{p^+}\right)C_{ab}^{+\nu}(p,q)\Big|_{\substack{q^+=0\\ q^-=(\nu+p_\perp\cdot q_\perp)/p^+}} \\ & \quad =\int dx^- d^2x_\perp e^{-ip_\perp\cdot x_\perp}\langle ps|[V_a^\mu(x),V_b^\nu(0)]_{x^+=0}|ps\rangle\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

from which one can immediately obtain the following fixed mass sum rules:

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_2^{[ab]}(q^2,\nu)=\pi f_{abc}\Gamma_c\,, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_3^{[ab]}(q^2,\nu)=\frac{1}{2}\pi f_{abc}\int_0^\infty d\alpha\overline{A}_c^1(0,\alpha)\,, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_4^{[ab]}(q^2,\nu)=\frac{1}{2}\pi f_{abc}\int_0^\infty d\alpha\overline{A}_c^2(0,\alpha)\,, \tag{3.18}$$

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_L^{[ab]}(q^2,\nu)=0\,, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu W_4^{(a,b)}(q^2,\nu)=0\,, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\int_0^\infty d\nu(\nu\not{}/-q^2)W_2^{(a,b)}(q^2,\nu)=\frac{1}{2}\pi d_{abc}\int_0^\infty d\alpha\overline{V}_c^1(0,\alpha)\,,\qquad q^2\le 0\,, \tag{3.21}$$

where $W_i^{(ab)}$ and $W_i^{[ab]}$ are the symmetric and antisymmetric decomposition of W_i^{ab} in ab: $W_i^{ab}=W_i^{(ab)}+iW_i^{[ab]}$, and $\overline{A}_c^i$ and $\overline{V}_c^i$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle p|A_a^\mu(x|0)-A_a^\mu(0|x)|p\rangle \\ & \quad =2i(s^\mu\overline{A}_a^1(x^2,x\cdot p)+p^\mu x\cdot s\overline{A}_a^2(x^2,x\cdot p)+x^\mu x\cdot sA_a^3(x^2,x\cdot p))\,, \\ & \langle p|V_a^\mu(x|0)-V_a^\mu(0|x)|p\rangle \\ & \quad =2i(p^\mu\overline{V}_a^1(x^2,x\cdot p)+x^\mu\overline{V}_a^2(x^2,x\cdot p))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Eq. (3.16) is the Dashen-Gell-Mann and Fubini sum rule, and Eq. (3.17) the so-called Beg sum rule. The sum rules of Eqs. (3.16-21) provide a large number of relations between the

various hadronic coupling constants and form factors that can be measured experimentally [31]. There are also many other sum rules among the matrix elements of various currents that can be derived in the same way. These are the earliest applications of light-front dynamics to the strong interaction phenomena. Theoretically, to justify these sum rules, one needs to develop the fundamental theory (QCD) on the light-front and to find the light-front hadronic states, which allow us to directly compute these matrix elements from first principles.

III-2. Light-Front Axial Charge and Its Dynamics

In this subsection, I will discuss the properties of the axial current and axial charge matrix elements in hadronic states, which are the most important parts for the understanding of hadronic structure.

Consider the axial current A^μ_a. The ordinary axial charge Q^5_a and the light-front axial charge Q^5_{aL} are defined respectively as follows:

$$Q^5_a(t) = \int d^3x A^0_a(x)\,, \tag{3.23}$$

$$Q^5_{aL}(x^+) = \frac{1}{2}\int dx^- d^2x_\perp A^+_a(x)\,. \tag{3.24}$$

Thus, the matrix elements of Q^5_a and Q^5_{aL} in two hadronic states, $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$, are related to the matrix elements of the axial current as follows:

$$\langle\beta|Q^5_a(t)|\alpha\rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta^3(\mathbf{p}_\beta - \mathbf{p}_\alpha)\langle\beta|A^0_a(t,0)|\alpha\rangle\,, \tag{3.25}$$

$$\langle\beta|Q^5_{al}(x^+)|\alpha\rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta(p^+_\beta - p^+_\alpha)\delta^2(\mathbf{p}_{\beta\perp} - \mathbf{p}_{\alpha\perp})\langle\beta|A^+_a(x^+,0)|\alpha\rangle\,. \tag{3.26}$$

The low-energy hadronic phenomena ensure that the axial current is partially conserved (PCAC):

$$\partial_\mu A^\mu_a = f_\pi m^2_\pi \pi_a\,, \tag{3.27}$$

where f_π is the pseudoscalar (here I simply call it the pionic) decay constant, m_π the pionic mass and π_a the pionic interpolating field with $a = 1, \cdots 8$ for $SU(3)$ flavor. PCAC implies that the matrix element of the axial current is dominated by the pionic mass pole [92,93]:

$$\langle\beta|A^\mu_a|\alpha\rangle_{m_\pi} = -if_\pi\langle\beta\pi_a|\alpha\rangle\frac{q^\mu}{q^2 - m^2_\pi} + \langle\beta|A^\mu_a|\alpha\rangle_N\,, \tag{3.28}$$

where $\langle\beta|A^\mu_a|\alpha\rangle_N$ denotes the nonpole matrix element. Using the PCAC and the identity, $\langle\beta|\pi_a|\alpha\rangle = -\frac{1}{q^2-m^2_\pi}\langle\beta\pi_a|\alpha\rangle$, we have

$$\langle\beta|A^\mu_a|\alpha\rangle = \left(g^\mu_\nu - \frac{q^\mu q_\nu}{q^2 - m^2_\pi}\right)\langle\beta|A^\nu_a(t,0)|\alpha\rangle_N\,, \qquad q = p_\beta - p_\alpha\,, \tag{3.29}$$

which leads to

$$\langle\beta|Q_a^5(0)|\alpha\rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta^3(\mathbf{p}_\beta - \mathbf{p}_\alpha)\frac{-m_\pi^2}{q^2 - m_\pi^2}\langle\beta|A_a^0(0)|\alpha\rangle_N\,, \tag{3.30}$$

$$\langle\beta|Q_{al}^5(0)|\alpha\rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta(p_\beta^+ - p_\alpha^+)\delta^2(\mathbf{p}_{\beta\perp} - \mathbf{p}_{\alpha\perp})\langle\beta|A_a^+(0)|\alpha\rangle_N\,. \tag{3.31}$$

Obviously, the matrix element of Q_a^5 in two hadronic states describes the pionic transition processes. But in the instant form the matrix element is singular and is zero in the chiral limit $m_\pi \to 0$; therefore it does not provide us with much information about dynamical chiral symmetry breaking while on the light-front the matrix element is well defined and is independent of the chiral limit. Furthermore, the equation of motion for the axial charge is

$$\frac{\partial Q_{aL}^5}{dx^+} = \frac{1}{i}[Q_{aL}^5, H_{LF}] = D\,, \tag{3.32}$$

where $H_{LF} = P^-$ is the QCD light-front Hamiltonian, and D is determined by the above commutation. Since the light-front momentum P^+, $P_\perp$ are conserved quantities and commute with Q_{aL}^5, this leads to

$$[Q_{aL}^5, P^+P^- - P_\perp^2] = [Q, M^2] = iP^+D\,, \tag{3.33}$$

where M^2 is a mass-square operator. Sandwiching the above equation between two hadronic states, we have

$$(m_\alpha^2 - m_\beta^2)\langle\beta|Q_{aL}^5|\alpha\rangle = ip^+\langle\beta|D|\alpha\rangle\,. \tag{3.34}$$

Combining Eqs. (3.31) and (3.34), we have made a simple but direct connection between the measurable hadronic phenomena and the fundamental QCD interaction. Obviously, the basic theoretical aspect that we need to explore here is H_{LF} and the corresponding bound states.

III-3. Parton Distribution Functions and Fragmentation Functions

Probing the hadronic structure functions via deep inelastic scattering experiments has dominated the study of the strong interaction and hadronic physics over the last twenty-five years since the discovery of the scaling rule of the structure functions by Bjorken [12] and the interpretation of the scaling behavior via the parton picture introduced by Feynman [10] in 1969. The parton picture emerges most naturally on the light-front. In the last subsection, we have discussed the sum rules for the hadronic structure functions which one extracts from cross sections measured in deep inelastic scattering. Theoretically, using the operator product expansion, the hadronic structure functions can be separated into hard and soft parts near the light-cone. The hard part is now known as the so-called

hard scattering coefficient in QCD, which is the short distance contribution of quarks and gluons to the structure functions. The soft part measures the low-energy (nonperturbative) properties of quarks and gluons in the parent hadron. When QCD is quantized on the light-front with the light-front gauge, the soft contribution can be identified with the parton distribution functions, i.e., the number density of partons as a function of the fraction of the light-front longitudinal momentum of the parent hadron. In the last two decades, QCD has been used extensively to compute the hard scattering coefficients that are relevant for the scale evolution of hadronic structure functions. However, the QCD based exploration of the nonperturbative part, the parton distribution functions themselves, is still in a very preliminary stage. The current high-energy experiments, such as the $e^- p$ HARE experiment and $p\bar{p}$ collisions at FNL and CERN, will provide more accurate information about the parton distribution functions over a broader range of the momentum transfer in these processes. Currently, the most interesting problem in the study of parton distribution functions is to look for the origin of proton spin and the small-x physics, as well as various inclusive heavy meson decay properties. Meanwhile, the study of the hadron productions in high energy processes, namely the fragmentation functions which measure the probability of finding a hadron in a high energy parton, is also one of the currently most interesting subjects. In this subsection, I will discuss the formulation of these problems on the light-front.

1. Distribution functions. In deep inelastic scattering, the cross section is proportional to the hadronic tensor which is defined by

$$W^{\mu\nu}(p,q) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d^4x e^{ipx}\langle ps|[J^\mu(x), J^\nu(0)]|ps\rangle\,. \tag{3.35}$$

We can rewrite $W^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of p, q, s and the invariant tensors $g^{\mu\nu}$ and $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ under the constraints of parity, time-reversal invariance and current conservation:

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\mu\nu}(p,q) = \;& W_1\left(-g^{\mu\nu}+\frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{q^2}\right)+\frac{W_2}{M^2}\left(p^\mu-\frac{\nu}{q^2}q^\mu\right)\left(p^\nu-\frac{\nu}{q^2}q^\nu\right) \\ & +iW_3\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}q_\alpha s_\beta + iW_4\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}q_\alpha(q\cdot p s_\beta - s\cdot q p_\beta)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where the W_i's are Lorentz invariant structure functions which determine the underlying hadrons. Based on the factorization theorem, the hadronic tensor can be separated into hard and soft parts:

$$W^{\mu\nu}(p,q) = \sum_{\tau=2}\left(\frac{\Lambda}{Q}\right)^{\tau-2}\sum_i\int d\{x_i\}C_{i\tau}^{\mu\nu}(x_B,\alpha(Q^2),\{x_i\})f_{i\tau}\left(\{x_i\},\frac{Q^2}{\Lambda^2}\right), \tag{3.37}$$

where $C_{i\tau}^{\mu\nu}$ is the hard parton scattering coefficient which can be calculated from perturbative QCD, while $f_{i\tau}$ is defined as the parton correlation function in a hadron, which is associated with the nonperturbative aspect of QCD. The notation τ represents the twist

index, x_i denotes the momentum fraction carried by the i-th parton, x_B is the Bjorken scale, $\alpha(Q^2)$ the QCD running coupling constant, Q^2 the momentum transfer by the photon, and Λ the scale of the strong interaction. On the light-front, $f_{i\tau}$ is reduced to the *parton distribution function*:

$$f_{i\tau}\left(\{x_i\}, \frac{Q^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) \propto \int \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi} e^{i\lambda x} \langle ps|\psi_{\pm}^{\dagger}(0)\Gamma^i \psi_{\pm}(n\lambda)|ps\rangle \,, \tag{3.38}$$

where $\Gamma^i = 1$, γ^5, $\gamma_\perp\gamma^5$, $n\lambda = x^-$ which means that the two field operators are separated in the longitudinal direction. The study of parton dynamics, which has dominated the investigation of the strong interaction in both experiments and QCD in the past twenty years, is indeed based on the above picture of factorization and parton distribution functions. There are a huge number of papers in the literature devoted to this aspect. A nice discussion and derivation may be found in Ellis, Furmanski and Petronzio's work [54], and a review paper given by Collins, Soper and Sterman could also be a good reference on this topic [55]. Jaffe

TABLE I.

	Twist-2: $O(1)$	Twist-3: $O(1/Q)$	Twist-4: $O(1/Q^2)$	
Γ^i	$++$	$+-$	$--$	Light-front projection
1	$f_1(x)$	$e(x)$	$f_4(x)$	Target spin average
γ^5	$g_1(x)$	$h_2(x)$	$g_3(x)$	Target helicity asymmetry
$\gamma_\perp\gamma^5$	$h_1(x)$	$g_T(x)$	$h_3(x)$	Target helicity flip

and Ji have recently classified various parton distribution functions based on the fermionic light-front up and down components and helicity on the light-front. These parton distribution functions can be naturally classified in terms of their helicity (spin) dependence and twists on the light-front, as we can see from Table I. For the detailed definition see Ref. [94].

2. Fragmentation functions. Fragmentation functions were introduced by Feynmen to describe hadron production from the underlying hard parton processes [11]. Collins and Soper showed later [95] that, in QCD, parton fragmentation functions can be defined as matrix elements of quark and gluon field operators at light-front separations. Physically, the quark and gluon fragmentation functions are the probability to find a hadron in a hard parton in hard processes, such as the lepton-hadron and hadron-hadron colliders. Explicitly, the quark fragmentation is defined by

$$f_{A/i}(z) = \frac{z}{36\pi}\int dx^- e^{-ip^+x^-/z}\mathrm{Tr}\langle 0|\phi_+(0)|H(p)s\rangle\langle H(p)s|\phi_+^\dagger(x^-)|0\rangle\,, \tag{3.39}$$

while the gluon fragmentation is

$$f_{A/g}(z) = \frac{-z}{32\pi k^+}\int dx^- e^{-ik^+x^-}\langle 0|F^{+\mu}(0)|H(p)s\rangle\langle H(p)s|F^+_\mu(x^-)|0\rangle\,, \tag{3.40}$$

where Tr traces the color and Dirac components of quarks, $|H(p)s\rangle$ is the hadronic states with the momentum p and the helicity s on the light-front. Here we have also taken the light-front gauge $A^+ = 0$, $F^{\mu\nu}$ is the usual gauge field strength tensor.

3. Inclusive decay of heavy-mesons. Recently it was found that, using the heavy quark symmetry and operator product expansion, heavy meson decay spectra can also be reformulated in terms of parton distribution functions [97]. Typical examples are the

radiative and semileptonic B-meson decay spectra which are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Gamma(B\to X_s\gamma)}{dE_\gamma} &= \int dk^+ \frac{d\Gamma_{parton}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, m_b^*)(f(k^+)+O(\Lambda/m_b))\,,\\ \frac{d\Gamma(B\to X_u l\overline{\nu})}{dE_l} &= \int dk^+ \frac{d\Gamma_{parton}}{dE_l}(E_l, m_b^*)(f(k^+)+O(\Lambda/m_b))\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

where $\frac{d\Gamma_{parton}}{dE}$ is the hard b-parton decay spectra. The universal parton distribution function inside the B meson, $f(k^+)$, is defined on the light-front:

$$f(k^+) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^- e^{ik^+x^-}\langle B(v)|h_+^\dagger(0)h_+(x^-)|B(v)\rangle\,, \tag{3.42}$$

with h_+ is the light-front up component of the heavy quark field and $|B(v)\rangle$ is the light-front B-meson states [96].

In conclusion, we can see that light-front dynamics has played a very important role in the study of the strong interaction phenomena in the past thirty years, especially for parton physics. Based on the kinematics, symmetry and unitarity of physical strong interaction processes, most of the measurable hadronic structural properties have been reduced to matrix elements of light-front field operators in the light-front hadronic bound states plus perturbative QCD corrections. The latter are calculatable from the fundamental theory. While these nonperturbative hadronic matrix elements (the form factors, the coupling constants, the parton distribution functions and parton fragmentation functions) have been understood quite well from the experimental data and some phenomenological model studies, unfortunately, we still lack a reliable approach to calculate these physical quantities from QCD. Obviously, in order to completely understand the strong interaction phenomena from the fundamental theory, it is natural to require the knowledge of the light-front QCD bound states for hadrons. In the next section, I will first discuss the structure of light-front wave functions for hadronic bound states. Then, in the subsequent sections, we shall look for a possible approach to determine these hadronic bound states from QCD on the light-front.

IV. STRUCTURE OF LIGHT-FRONT BOUND STATES

In terms of the standard language of field theory, relativistic bound states and resonances are identified by the occurrence of poles in Green functions. Although the information extracted from this approach provides a definition of physical particles, it does not provide their detailed properties, namely their wave functions which determine all the structures of the particles. In order to understand the dynamics of hadrons, we need to find the explicit form of the hadronic wave functions.

However, the wave functions of bound states in field theory have not been well established. One may define the wave functions as the eigenstates of P^0 and may determine them by solving the eigenequation of P^0. But P^0 is a square root function of the momentum and mass which does not give us a clear picture of the Schrödinger eigenstate equation in quantum mechanics. The well-defined framework for finding the relativistic bound states is to solve the Bethe-Salpeter equation. However, the Bethe-Salpeter equation only provides the amplitude of a Fock sector in the bound states so that it cannot be normalized. In other words, the Bethe-Salpeter amplitudes do not have the precise meaning of wave functions for particles.

In principle, the wave function of a relativistic bound state can always be written as an operator function of the particle creation operators acting on the vacuum of the theory. However, for many theories that we are interested in, especially for QCD, the vacuum is very complicated. Thus, it is even more difficult to formally write down a relativistic bound state wave function.

In this section, I will discuss how these difficulties may be solved when we look at the problem on the light-front.

IV-1. Light-Front Vacuum

In the equal-time framework, the vacuum of QCD is crucial for a realization of chiral symmetry breaking. From the vacuum the axial charges Q_5^a $(a = 1, \cdots 8)$ can create pseudoscalar particles which are the lowest bound states in the strong interaction regime that have been used as the building blocks in the development of the effective chiral field theory for low-energy hadron dynamics. Undoubtedly, the complicated vacuum is the most important object to be understood for the nonperturbative aspect of QCD. As we have already argued, it is also a starting point for the construction of hadronic wave functions. However, the understanding of the true QCD vacuum is still very limited, although a lot of informative work has been carried out in the past two decades based on the instanton phenomena [66] and the QCD sum rule [71].

In the light-front coordinates, a particle's momentum is divided into the longitudinal component (along the light-front time direction $x^+ = t+x^3$) and the transverse components (perpendicular to the light-front time direction). The longitudinal momentum of each particle, $p^+ = p^0 + p^3$, cannot be negative since the energy of a physical state always dominates its momentum. As a result, the light-front vacuum for any interacting field theory can only be occupied by the particles with zero-longitudinal momentum, namely

$$|vac\rangle_{LF} = f(a^\dagger_{k^+=0})|0\rangle\,, \tag{4.1}$$

so that $P^+|vac\rangle_{LF} = 0$, where $P^+ = \sum_i k_i^+$. At this point, the light-front vacuum is still nontrivial. In the past several years, many tried to solve the so-called zero-mode (the

particles with $k^+ = 0$) problem to obtain a nontrivial light-front vacuum but not much useful progress has been made since then [98-107].

To construct hadronic bound states in the Fock space of quarks and gluons, it is natural to ask whether one can simplify the vacuum so that we can easily construct the hadronic states by the use of the Fock space expansion with a trivial vacuum. It is obvious that if we can remove the basic constituents with zero longitudinal light-front momentum, the vacuum of the full interacting theory is the same as the free field theory, namely

$$|vac\rangle_{LF} = |0\rangle\,. \tag{4.2}$$

To remove these particles with zero longitudinal momentum, we can either use a prescription that requires the field variables to satisfy the antisymmetric boundary condition in the light-front longitudinal direction [88] or deal with a cutoff theory that imposes $p^+ > \epsilon$ on the momentum expansion of each field variable, where ϵ is a small number [85]. Thus, the positivity of longitudinal momentum with such a prescription or an explicit cutoff ensures that the light-front vacuum must be trivial, as has been shown above. Now the wave function of a relativistic bound state can be expressed as an ordinary Fock state expansion:

$$|\Psi\rangle = f(a^\dagger)|0\rangle\,. \tag{4.3}$$

For QCD, $a^\dagger$ should be the quark, antiquark and gluon creation operators with nonzero longitudinal momentum, and $f(a^\dagger)$ must be a color singlet operator.

Of course, in this case, the light-front axial charge, denoted by Q^a_{5L}, vanishes the vacuum state. One might ask that, once the vacuum is simple, what happens to the nontrivial effect of the theory associated with the nontrivial vacuum. At least we believe that confinement and chiral symmetry breaking in QCD must be a result of the nontrivial vacuum. In the next subsections, we will take two simple examples, the sigma model and 1+1 QCD, to show how the zero-mode particles are removed but the nontrivial vacuum effects and confinement mechanism can be recovered or manifested. But before we explore the nontrivial vacuum effects with the trivial vacuum structure, I would like to discuss first the light-front bound state equation.

IV-2. Light-Front Bound State Equation

Once the light-front vacuum becomes trivial, the light-front bound states for various hadrons can be expanded in terms of the Fock space. Explicitly, a hadronic bound state labeled by α with the total longitudinal and transverse momenta P^+ and $P_\perp$, and the helicity (the total spin along the longitudinal direction) λ can be expressed as follows:

$$|\alpha, P^+, P_\perp, \lambda\rangle = \sum_{n,\lambda_i} \int' \frac{dx_i d^2k_{\perp i}}{2(2\pi)^3} |n, x_iP^+, x_iP_\perp + k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i\rangle \Phi_{n/\alpha}(x_i, k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i)\,, \tag{4.4}$$

where n represents n constituents contained in the state $|n, x_i P^+, x_i P_\perp + k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i\rangle$, λ_i is the helicity of the i-th constituent, and $\int'$ denotes the integral over the space:

$$\sum_i x_i = 1\,, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_i k_{\perp i} = 0\,, \tag{4.5}$$

here x_i is the fraction of the total longitudinal momentum that the i-th constituent carries, and $k_{\perp i}$ is its relative transverse momentum with respect to the center of mass frame:

$$x_i = \frac{p_i^+}{P^+}\,, \qquad k_{i\perp} = p_{i\perp} - x_i P_\perp\,, \tag{4.6}$$

with p_i^+, $p_{i\perp}$ being the transverse and longitudinal momentum of the i-th constituent, and $\Phi_{n/\alpha}(x_i, k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i)$ the amplitude of the Fock state $|n, x_i P^+, x_i P_\perp + k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i\rangle$ with the normalization condition:

$$\sum_{n,\lambda_i} \int' \frac{dx_i d^2 k_{\perp i}}{2(2\pi)^3} |\Phi_{n/\alpha}(x_i, k_{\perp i}, \lambda_i)|^2 = 1\,. \tag{4.7}$$

The eigenstate equation that the wave functions obey on the light-front is obtained from the operator Einstein equation $P^2 = P^+P^- - P_\perp^2 = M^2$:

$$H_{LF}|\alpha, P^+, P_\perp, \lambda\rangle = \frac{P_\perp^2 + M_\alpha^2}{P^+}|\alpha, P^+, P_\perp, \lambda\rangle\,, \tag{4.8}$$

where $H_{LF} = P^-$ is the light-front Hamiltonian. Futhermore, since the boost on the light-front only depends on kinematics, we can consider the bound state in the rest frame ($P_\perp = 0$, $P^+ = M_\alpha$). Thus, the eigenstate equation simply becomes:

$$H_{LF}|\alpha, P^+, P_\perp = 0, \lambda\rangle = M_\alpha|\alpha, P^+, P_\perp = 0, \lambda\rangle\,, \tag{4.9}$$

which is the familiar Schrödinger equation in ordinary quantum mechanics. On the light-front, boosting a bound state in the rest frame to any other frame is quite simple, and is dynamically independent, as we have shown in Eq. (2.10). Thus, once we find the bound state in the rest frame, we can completely understand the particle structure in any frame. Yet this is not true in the instant form. In the instant form, although the bound state equation in the rest frame has the same form, the solutions in the rest frame are not easily boosted to other Lorentz frames due to the dynamical dependence of the boost transformation. Therefore, in each different Lorentz frame, one needs to solve the bound state equation of P^0 to obtain the corresponding wave functions. This is perhaps the reason why we have not established a reliable approach to construct relativistic wave functions in the instant field theory in terms of the Schrödinger picture. This obstacle is obviously removed on the light-front.

To see the explicit form of the light-front bound state equation, let us consider a meson wave function (for instance, a pion, [47]). The light-front bound state equation can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(m_\pi^2-\sum_i\frac{k_{i\perp}^2+m_i^2}{x_i}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}\Psi_{q\bar{q}}\\ \Psi_{q\bar{q}g}\\ \vdots\end{array}\right)\\ =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}\langle q\bar{q}|H_{int}|q\bar{q}\rangle & \langle q\bar{q}|H_{int}|q\bar{q}g\rangle & \cdots\\ \langle q\bar{q}g|H_{int}|q\bar{q}\rangle & \cdots & \\ \vdots & & \end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}\Psi_{q\bar{q}}\\ \Psi_{q\bar{q}g}\\ \vdots\end{array}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Of course, to exactly solve the above equation for the whole Fock space is still impossible. Currently, two approaches have been developed. One is given by Brodsky and Pauli [108-111], the so-called discretize light-front approach, the other by Perry, Harindranath and Wilson [112-115], based on the old idea of the Tamm-Dancoff approach [116,117] that truncates the Fock space to only include these Fock states with a small number of particles. Furthermore, if one can eliminate all the high order Fock space sectors (approximately) by an effective two-body interaction kernel, the light-front bound state equation is reduced to the light-front Bethe-Salpeter equation:

$$\left(m_\pi^2-\frac{k_\perp^2+m^2}{x(1-x)}\right)\Psi_{q\bar{q}}(x,k_\perp)=\int\frac{dyd^2k'_\perp}{2(2\pi)^3}V_{eff}(x,k_\perp,y,k'_\perp)\Psi_{q\bar{q}}(y,k'_\perp)\,. \tag{4.11}$$

The advantage for Eq. (4.10) with the Tamm-Dancoff approximation is that it provides a reliable way to study the contribution of Fock states which contain more particles step by step by increasing the size of truncated Fock space, while the Bethe-Salpeter equation lacks such an ability.

IV-3. Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking on the Light-Front

Now, we turn back to the question that if the vacuum on the light-front becomes trivial, how are we to realize the physics of the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking and the associated Goldstone bosons which are all the theoretical underpinning for our understanding of the low-energy theorem. We argue that eliminating the longitudinal zero modes leads to a trivial light-front vacuum, as a result, the theory must become explicitly symmetry breaking by a proper modification of the Hamiltonian. To be explicit, let us consider the sigma model as an example. The sigma model is one of the few models in field theory that can clearly demonstrate the mechanism of spontaneously symmetry breaking.

The Lagrangian density of the sigma model is given by

$$\mathcal{L}=\frac{1}{2}((\partial^\mu\sigma)^2+(\partial^\mu\pi)^2)-V(\sigma^2+\pi^2)\,, \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$V(\sigma^2+\pi^2) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^2(\sigma^2+\pi^2) + \frac{\lambda}{4}(\sigma^2+\pi^2)^2\,. \tag{4.13}$$

It is well-known that this Lagrangian has a continuous rotational symmetry in the $\sigma-\pi$ plane. This symmetry is spontaneously broken since the vacuum expectation value of the field variables, for example the σ field, does not vanish (the vacuum is nontrivial). As a result the π is a Goldstone boson.

Now we want to define the theory on the light-front such that the vacuum is trivial but the massless π can be determined in an alternative way (i.e., it is not realized from the mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking).

Since the original theory contains a zero mode in the σ field, we can remove the zero modes by shifting the σ field to σ' such that σ' does not contain zero modes: $\sigma' = \sigma - \sigma_v$. The resulting potential in terms of (σ', π) is

$$\begin{aligned} V(\sigma',\pi) = \lambda\Big(\frac{1}{4}(\sigma'^2+\pi^2) + \sigma_v\sigma'(\sigma'^2+\pi^2) + \frac{3}{2}\sigma_v^2\sigma'^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_v^2\pi^2 + \sigma_v^3\sigma' + \sigma_v^4\Big) \\ -\mu^2(\sigma'^2+\pi^2+2\sigma_v\sigma'+\sigma_v^2)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

With this potential, the vacuum is trivial. Now the question is, what is the value of σ_v which cannot be determined in the theory with the zero modes removed. However, current conservation can be used to fix σ_v. The continuous transformation of the original potential leads to a conserved current: $j^\mu = \sigma\partial^\mu\pi - \pi\partial^\mu\sigma$. After the shift, it becomes:

$$j^\mu = \sigma'\partial^\mu\pi - \pi\partial^\mu\sigma' + \sigma_v\partial^\mu\pi\,. \tag{4.15}$$

The dropping of the zero longitudinal momentum modes however does not affect local current conservation, $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$. It is easy to check that current conservation results in the value of $\sigma_v = \sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{2\lambda}}$. The potential then is reduced to

$$V(\sigma',\pi) = \frac{1}{2}\mu^2\sigma'^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}(\sigma'^2+\pi^2)^2 + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda\mu^2}{2}}\,(\sigma'^2+\pi^2)\sigma'\,, \tag{4.16}$$

which shows that the pion is massless. One can now find that the charge $Q = \frac{1}{2}\int dx^- d^2x_\perp j^+$ no longer commutes with the Hamiltonian. Thus, in the theory with zero modes dropped, the Hamiltonian explicitly breaks the symmetry and the vacuum is trivial but the pion is still massless.

It may be noted that the above analysis is also true for the instant formulation but the conclusion is different. In the instant form, we can follow the same route (by a shift of the σ field) to determine the symmetry breaking and the massless π but it has nothing to do with the simplification of the vacuum. The shift in the instant form does remove the zero modes from the theory but the instant vacuum is not only occupied by the zero modes.

Of course, the above demonstration of symmetry breaking, with a trivial vacuum on the light-front, cannot be directly applied to QCD. The situation with QCD on the light-front is much worse than the sigma model. In QCD, the operator that is expected to have a non-zero vacuum expectation value due to spontaneous symmetry breaking is the composite operator $\overline{\psi}\psi$ where ψ is the quark field. There is no obvious mechanism for this expectation value to show up in the QCD Hamiltonian since the QCD Hamiltonian does not apparently contain squares or higher power terms of $\overline{\psi}\psi$. This is perhaps the reason that all these beautiful but naive pictures of spontaneously symmetry breaking are not manifest in QCD. However, the trivial vacuum with an explicitly symmetry breaking Hamiltonian on the light-front may provide a new avenue to explore the physics associated with Goldstone particles. Therefore, for QCD, the light-front zero modes are not the essential problem we need to solve. The problem is how we can obtain a correct effective Hamiltonian after the elimination of zero modes.

IV-4. Bound States in 1+1 QCD and Confinement

Perhaps a clear understanding of quark confinement is best seen in the quark dynamics of 1+1 QCD on the light-front [118]. Here we will demonstrate the confinement mechanism on the light-front in this theory with a trivial vacuum. The Lagrangian density for 1+1 QCD is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{1+1} = -\frac{1}{4}F_a^{\mu\nu}F_{a\mu\nu} + \overline{\psi}(i\gamma\cdot D - m)\psi\,, \tag{4.17}$$

where $F_a^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A_a^\nu - \partial^\nu A_a^\mu - g f^{abc} A_b^\mu A_c^\nu$ and $D^\mu = \partial^\mu + igT^a A_a^\mu$, with $\mu,\nu = +$ or $-$. If we take the light-front gauge, $A_a^+ = 0$, the Lagrangian can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}_{1+1} = i\psi_+^\dagger\partial^-\psi + i\psi_-^\dagger\partial^+\psi_- + g j_a^+ A_a^- - \frac{1}{4}(\partial^+ A^-)^2\,, \tag{4.18}$$

where ψ_- and A_a^- are the light-front constraint variables that satisfy the following constraint equations:

$$\psi_- = -im\beta\frac{1}{\partial^+}\psi_+\,, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\partial^+ A_a^- = 2g\frac{1}{\partial^+}j_a^+\,, \qquad j_a^+ = 2\psi_+^\dagger T^a\psi_+\,. \tag{4.20}$$

Then the light-front 1+1 QCD Hamiltonian is simply given by

$$H_{1+1} = \int dx^-\left\{m^2\psi_+^\dagger\frac{1}{i\partial^+}\psi_+ - 2g^2 j_a^+\frac{1}{\partial^{+2}}j_a^+\right\}. \tag{4.21}$$

The confinement can be seen explicitly if we use the definition of Eq. (2.16) for the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$. In such a definition, we have removed the zero longitudinal modes. The Hamiltonian

becomes

$$H_{1+1} = \frac{1}{4}\int dx^+dx'^-\Big\{-im^2\psi_+^\dagger(x^-)\varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\psi_+(x'^-) \\ -g^2 j_a^+(x^-)|x^- - x'^-|j_a^+(x'^-)\Big\} + \left(\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda\frac{g^2}{4}\left(\int dx^- j_a^+(x^-)\right)\right)^2 . \tag{4.22}$$

In this Hamiltonian the first term is the free quark mass term, the second term is a linear confinement potential between quarks, and the last term is a singular (divergent) term due to the elimination of the zero modes. It is this term that forbids the observation of a single quark. To see how the confinement mechanism is manifested in this theory, let us consider the color non-singlet single quark state and the color-singlet two quark bound state.

Let us first consider a single quark state: $|P^+, c\rangle = b_c^\dagger(P^+)|0\rangle$, where $b_c^\dagger(p^+)$ is the quark creation operator with momentum p^+ and color index c;

$$\psi_{c+}(x^-) = \int \frac{dp^+}{4\pi}[b_c(p^+)e^{ip^+x^-/2} + d_c^\dagger(p^+)e^{-ip^+x^-/2}]\,, \tag{4.23}$$

satisfies the light-front fermion commutation relations. It is easy to check that the solution of the single quark bound state equation,

$$P^-|P^+, c\rangle = H_{1+1}|P^+, c\rangle = \frac{M^2}{P^+}|P^+, c\rangle\,, \tag{4.24}$$

is

$$M^2 = m^2 - \frac{g^2}{4\pi}C_f + \frac{g^2}{8}C_f\frac{P^+}{\epsilon}\,, \tag{4.25}$$

with $C_f = T^aT^a = \frac{3}{4}$, $\epsilon = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \to 0(\lambda \to \infty)$. Obviously $M^2 \to \infty$ ($\epsilon \to 0$) which implies that no single quark can be measured. In other words, the quark is confined. This confinement mechanism is obviously an effect of the original nontrivial vacuum since the term $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ originates from the elimination of the $k^+ = 0$ singularity.

Now we consider the quark-antiquark color singlet state:

$$|\Psi(P)\rangle = \int \frac{dp^+}{4\pi}\Phi(p^+)b_c^\dagger(p^+)d_c^\dagger(P^+ - p^+)|0\rangle\,. \tag{4.26}$$

The eigenstate equation of the above bound state is

$$\left(M^2 - \frac{m^2}{x(1-x)}\right)\Phi(x) = \frac{g^2}{\pi}C_f\int\frac{dy}{4\pi}\frac{\Phi(y)-\Phi(x)}{(x-y)^2}\,. \tag{4.27}$$

Here the confinement of two quarks is given by a linear potential (the right hand side of the above equation). The singular term in Eq. (4.22) does not contribute to the above bound state equation since it is proportional to the color charge operator, and M^2 should be finite.

The above equation does not have an analytic solution. The discussion about the general form of the wave function can be found in Ref. [118]. The approach can be applied to 1+1 QED where an additional property, namely the gauge anomaly, can be addressed canonically [119]. However, I must emphasize that all the conclusions about quark confinement obtained here disappear when we consider the real theory of the strong interaction, namely 3+1 QCD. As we will see later, in 3+1 QCD there are physical gauge degrees of freedom (the transverse gauge field) which cancel the effect of confinement from the linear potential due to the elimination of the unphysical gauge degrees of freedom. Nevertheless, here it shows that eliminating the zero longitudinal momentum modes leads to a trivial vacuum but the confinement mechanism can be manifested in the Hamiltonian. Undoubtedly, the manifestation of confinement in 3+1 QCD with a trivial vacuum must be much more complicated and we will address it later.

It may be worth mentioning that in the last few years, many studies on nonperturbative features of light-front dynamics were focused on the 1+1 field theory. Typical examples are: the discretized light-front quantization approach for the bound states in the 1+1 field theory developed by Pauli and Brodsky [108,120], spontaneous symmetry breaking and vacuum structure in the 1+1 Yukawa model first considered by Harindranath and Vary [121], the light-front Tamm-Dancoff approach for bound state Fock space truncation discussed by Perry *et al.* [112,113], and other extensive discussions of various 1+1 field theory models of these aspects [122-128].

IV-5. Phenomenological Hadronic Bound States on the Light-Front

At the present time, how to solve for the bound states, discussed above in this section, from 3+1 QCD is still unknown. Hence, it may be useful to have some insights into the light-front behavior of the meson and baryon wave functions which have been constructed phenomenologically in describing hadrons. In fact, the phenomenological light-front meson and baryon bound states have been studied extensively in the last few years, this is called the relativistic quark model which was initially proposed by Terent'ev in 1976 [129,130]. The motivation is to provide a simple relativistic constituent quark model for mesons and baryons that can yield a consistent description of the hadronic properties for both low and high Q^2.

The general construction of the phenomenological wave functions is based on the non-relativistic constituent quark model. The constituent quark model has been very successful in the description of hadronic structure based on a very simple structure, namely that all mesons consist of a quark and antiquark pair and the baryons are made of three constituent quarks, their wave functions satisfy the $SU(6)$ classification and Zweig's rule which suppresses particle production in favor of rearrangement of constituents for hadrons

[76-78,157,80]. However, such a simple picture is very difficult to understand from QCD, due to its nonrelativistic assumption and due to our belief that the QCD vacuum must be very complicated so that hadrons must contain an infinite number of quark-antiquark pairs and gluons.

The light-front wave functions describe the relativistic hadronic structure with a nonrelativistic form. Furthermore, the simple vacuum on the light-front ensures the validity of the Fock state expansion of hadronic wave functions. With the assumption of existence of constituent quarks (with masses of hundreds of MeVs), the leading approximation to hadronic wave functions that consist of a quark-antiquark pair for mesons and a three-quark cluster for baryons should be a reasonable starting point.

However, it is not so easy to identify the light-front hadronic wave functions with hadronic states. The difficulty is their spin structure. On the light-front, we are unable to kinematically construct the hadronic wave functions with fixed spin. The light-front wave functions discussed in the last section are labeled by helicity not spin. In these calculations of the parton distribution and fragmentation functions, the hadronic bound states are defined or classified in terms of the helicity (=chirality). However, when we use the light-front wave functions to compute the hadronic structural quantities, such as hadronic decay form factors and coupling constants, we must have states with a definite spin. A general solution to the spin problem on the light-front has not been found. However, phenomenologically, the helicity part of the wave functions on the light-front can be transformed to a light-front spin wave function part via the so-called Melosh transformation (which is exact only for free quark theory) such that the hadronic states can be projected (approximately) from the set of light-front wave functions with fixed helicity [131,132]. Here, I list the detailed meson and baryon light-front wave functions that have been used to calculate various hadronic quantities in the past few years.

The general form of the phenomenological light-front hadronic bound states has a similar structure to the constituent quark model states: for meson states (Eq. (4.4) with only the $q\bar{q}$ Fock space sector),

$$\begin{aligned} &|P^+, P_\perp, SS_3\rangle \\ &\quad = \int \frac{dxd^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3} \sum_{\lambda_1\lambda_2} \Psi_m^{SS_3}(x, k_\perp, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)|x, k_\perp, \lambda_1; 1-x, -k_\perp, \lambda_2\rangle \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

and for baryon states (Eq. (4.4) with the three quark Fock space sector),

$$\begin{aligned} |P^+, P_\perp, SS_3\rangle = \sum_{\lambda_i} \int \prod_i^2 \frac{dx_i d^2k_{1\perp}}{16\pi^3} \Psi_b^{SS_3}(x_i, k_{i\perp}, \lambda_i) \\ \times |x_1, k_{1\perp}, \lambda_1; x_2, k_{2\perp}, \lambda_2; 1-x_1-x_2, -(k_{1\perp}+k_{2\perp}), \lambda_3\rangle \,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

where Ψ^{SS_3} is the amplitude of the corresponding $q\bar{q}$ or three quark sector (the wave function

of the quark model):

$$\Psi^{SS_3} = \mathcal{F}\,\Xi^{SS_3}(k_{i\perp}, \lambda_i)\Phi(x_i, k_{i\perp})\,, \tag{4.30}$$

with $\mathcal{F}$ the flavor part of the wave function which is the same as in the constituent quark model, and Ξ and Φ are the spin and space parts that depend on the dynamics. By using the Melosh transformation,

$$R_M(k_{i\perp}, m_i) = \frac{m_i + x_i M_0 - i\vec{\sigma}\cdot(\vec{n}\times\vec{k}_{i\perp})}{\sqrt{(m_i + x_i M_0)^2 + k_{i\perp}^2}}\,, \tag{4.31}$$

where $\vec{n} = (0, 0, 1)$, $\vec{\sigma}$ is the Pauli spin matrix, m_i the i-th constituent quark mass, and M_0 satisfies

$$M_0^2 = \sum_i \frac{k_{i\perp}^2 + m_i^2}{x_i}\,, \tag{4.32}$$

the light-front spin wave function is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\Xi_m^{SS_3}(k_\perp, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)\\ &\quad= \sum_{s_1,s_2} \langle\lambda_1|R_M^\dagger(k_\perp, m_1)|s_1\rangle\langle\lambda_2|R_M^\dagger(-k_\perp, m_2)|s_2\rangle\left\langle \frac{1}{2}s_1, \frac{1}{2}s_2\middle| SS_3\right\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

for mesons; for baryons the spin part is rather complicated for a detailed construction, see Ref. [133]. The momentum part of the wave function is

$$\Phi_m(x_i, k_{i\perp}) = \mathcal{N}_m \exp(-M_0^2/2\beta_m^2)\,, \tag{4.34}$$

for mesons and for baryons

$$\Phi_b(x_i, k_{i\perp}) = \mathcal{N}_b \frac{1}{(1 + M_0^2/\beta_b^2)^{3.5}}\,, \tag{4.35}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the normalization constant and β is a parameter fixed by the data. The exponential function for the momentum wave function of baryons has also been used but Schlumpf found that the pole-type wave function is much better fit to the data with high momentum transfer [133].

These phenomenological light-front wave functions have been widely used to calculate hadronic form factors and coupling constants; the results are in pretty good agreement with experiments for a very broad range of momentum transfer; (see Fig. 3 and 4), and are much better than the nonrelativistic constituent quark model and other phenomenological descriptions [134-137,133].

There is also another phenomenological light-front wave function derived by Chernyak from QCD sum rules [138]. Such a wave function is valid for relatively high momentum transfer, and recently it has also been applied to describe various hadronic processes [97,139,140].

However, all these are just a phenomenological understanding of light-front hadronic wave functions. If these wave functions are very close to the real wave functions of hadrons, they must be solved dynamically from QCD. In the remaining sections of this article, I will discuss QCD on the light-front.

FIG. 3. Proton form factor calculated by the use of the phenomenological light-front proton wave function [133]. The solid line is given by the pole-type wave function while the dashed line is based on the Gaussian-type wave function.

V. LIGHT-FRONT QCD

As we have mentioned several times, an intuitive physical picture of high-energy processes is provided by the partonic interpretation [11]. We have already seen that such a picture emerges most naturally in the light-front canonical quantization with the light-front gauge $A_a^+ = A_a^0 + A_a^3 = 0$. In the last two decades, QCD with either the covariant gauge or the light-front gauge has been used extensively to compute the hard scattering coefficients that are relevant for the scale evolution of hadronic structure functions. However, the QCD based exploration of the nonperturbative part, such as the parton distribution functions, is still in a very preliminary stage. One may also note that many practical calculations for short distance QCD have been performed in the standard Feynman perturbation theory with the light-front gauge [42,141,142,54,143]. In this scheme, Feynman rules are derived by the use of the path integral approach with a (light-front) gauge-fixing term [40] and various hard scattering coefficients are calculated via either the operator product expansion [42,141] or a Feynman diagrammatic approach [142,54,143]. Despite the successful perturbative calculations, it is still not clear whether one can extend the Feynman approach to nonperturbative studies, such as the QCD calculation of parton distribution functions, which requires the full information of the hadronic bound states.

Current attempts to explore nonperturbative QCD on the light-front, as we have emphasized throughout this paper, are based on the Hamiltonian theory, which is defined by quantizing the theory on a light-front plane *via* equal-x^+ (the light-front time) commutation relations, as was first developed by Kogut and Soper for QED [21]. In the light-front QCD Hamiltonian theory, the hadronic bound states may be obtained by diagonalizing a light-

FIG. 4. Pion form factor calculated by the use of the phenomenological light-front pion wave function [134]. The different lines correspond to different Parameters used in the phenomenological wave function.

front QCD Hamiltonian in a truncated quark-gluon Fock space based on the old ideas of Tamm and Dancoff [116,117]. In this formalism the low-energy hadronic structures, namely the parton distribution functions, parton fragmentation functions, various hadronic form factors and strong interaction coupling constants, can be addressed directly from QCD. Meanwhile, the short distance behavior can also be studied in the same framework, i.e., in the old-fashioned perturbation theory or explicitly in the x^+-ordered perturbative QCD Hamiltonian theory based on equal-x^+ commutation relations [47]. Indeed, the interpretation of high-energy processes via the parton picture had led to extensive investigations of perturbative field theory in the infinite momentum frame in the early 70's, as we have mentioned in the introduction. At that time Drell, Levy and Yan [15] and Bjorken, Kogut and Soper [17] had already pointed out that, in the old-fashioned theory, the physical picture for various real physical processes becomes much clearer. The parton picture is just a typical example.

Yet, beyond applications to the exclusive processes given by Lepage and Brodsky in the early 80's [47], the x^+-ordered Hamiltonian QCD has not been explored and extensively utilized in the last decade. Only very recently, loop calculations in the x^+-ordered perturbative QED and QCD theory have been performed [144-147,82,148]. It is seen that there are severe divergences in light-front QCD which are associated with light-front gauge singularities. However, a systematic computational method, which involves various regularization and renormalization schemes for light-front singularities and ultraviolet transverse divergences, has not been well established. In fact, although the light-front gauge is known

to be a convenient gauge in practical QCD calculations for short distance behavior, there are persistent concerns about its utility because of its "singular" nature. The study of nonperturbative QCD on the light-front for hadronic bound states requires one to gain *a priori* systematic control of such gauge singularities. Clearly, it will be very helpful to first understand the canonical structure of light-front QCD and the origin of various singular problems before we go on to explore the nonperturbative properties light-front QCD.

In this section I will discuss the canonical form of light-front QCD, the origin of the light-front gauge singularity, the light-front two-component formulation of QCD, the old-fashioned perturbation theory, various severe infra-red (IR) divergences occurring in the old-fashioned light-front Hamiltonian calculations for QCD and the associated nontrivial QCD structures. I will also discuss some of the difficulties caused by the light-front gauge singularity in applications to both the old-fashioned perturbative calculations for short distance physics and the upcoming nonperturbative investigations for hadronic bound states.

V-1. Canonical Light-Front QCD

The QCD Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}) + \overline{\psi}(i\gamma_\mu D^\mu - m)\psi\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where $F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu - ig[A^\mu, A^\nu]$, $A^\mu = \sum_a A^\mu_a T^a$ is a 3×3 gluon field color matrix and the T^a are the generators of the $SU(3)$ color group: $[T^a, T^b] = if^{abc}T^c$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(T^aT^b) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}$. The field variable ψ describes quarks with three colors and N_f flavors, $D^\mu = \partial^\mu - igA^\mu$ is the symmetric covariant derivative, and m is an $N_f \times N_f$ diagonal quark mass matrix. The Lagrange equations of motion are well-known:

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu}_a + gf^{abc}A_{b\mu}F^{\mu\nu}_c + g\overline{\psi}\gamma^\nu T^a\psi = 0\,, \tag{5.2}$$

$$(i\gamma_\mu\partial^\mu - m + g\gamma_\mu A^\mu)\psi = 0\,. \tag{5.3}$$

1. Light-front QCD Hamiltonian. The canonical theory of QCD on the light-front is constructed as follows. The conjugate momenta of the field variables $\{A^\mu_a(x), \psi(x)\}$ are defined by

$$E^\mu_a(x) = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^- A_{a\mu})} = -\frac{1}{2}F^{+\mu}_a(x)\,, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\pi_\psi(x) = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^-\psi)} = \frac{i}{2}\overline{\psi}\gamma^+ = i\psi^\dagger_+(x)\,. \tag{5.5}$$

In terms of the field variables and their conjugates, the Lagrangian density can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \left\{\frac{1}{2}F^{+i}_a(\partial^- A^i_a) + i\psi^\dagger_+(\partial^-\psi_+)\right\} - \mathcal{H} - \{A^-_a\mathcal{C}_a + \psi^\dagger_-\mathcal{C}\}\,, \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} = \quad & \frac{1}{2}(E_a^{-2} + B_a^{-2}) + \psi_+^\dagger\{\alpha_\perp \cdot (i\partial_\perp + gA_\perp) + \beta m\}\psi_- \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{2}\partial^+(E_a^- A_a^-) - \partial^i(E_a^i A_a^-)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_a = \frac{1}{2}(\partial^+ E_a^- + g f^{abc} A_b^+ E_c^-) - (\partial^i E_a^i + g f^{abc} A_b^i E_c^i) + g\psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+ \,, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\mathcal{C} = (i\partial^+ + gA^+)\psi_- - (i\alpha_\perp \cdot \partial_\perp + g\alpha_\perp \cdot A_\perp + \beta m)\psi_+ \,. \tag{5.9}$$

In Eq. (5.7), we have defined $B_a^- = F_a^{12}$ as the longitudinal component of the light-front color magnetic field.

The reason for writing the Lagrangian in the above form is to make the Hamiltonian density and also the dynamical variables and constraints manifest. Here the time derivatives have explicitly been separated from the others, from which it immediately follows that only the transverse gauge fields A_a^i and the up-component quark fields ψ_+ and $\psi_+^\dagger$ are dynamical variables. The Hamiltonian density $\mathcal{H}$ contains three parts; the first part involves the light-front color electric and magnetic fields; the second, the usual quark Hamiltonian with coupling to the gauge field and the last a surface term. The last terms in this new form of the QCD Lagrangian indicate that the longitudinal gauge field A_a^- and the down-component quark fields ψ_- are only Lagrange multipliers for the constraints $\mathcal{C}_a, \mathcal{C} = 0$. This is true even for the free field theory, as we have already seen in Sec. II. With the use of the equations of motion, one can verify that the gauge field constraint, $\mathcal{C}_a = 0$, is in fact the light-front Gauss law which is an intrinsic property of gauge theory. The fermion constraint, $\mathcal{C} = 0$, is purely a consequence of using the light-front coordinates. The existence of constraint terms simply implies that QCD in the light-front coordinates is a generalized Hamiltonian system. These constraints are all secondary, first-class constraints in the Dirac procedure of quantization [86]. To obtain a canonical formulation of light-front QCD for non-perturbative calculations we need to explicitly solve the constraints, namely to determine the Lagrange multipliers, to all orders of the coupling constant. Generally, it is very difficult to analytically determine the Lagrange multipliers from the constraints $\mathcal{C}_a, \mathcal{C} = 0$ since they are coupled by A_a^+. But if we choose the light-front gauge, $A_a^+(x) = 0$, the constraints are reduced to solvable one-dimensional differential equations:

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial^+ E_a^- = \partial^i E_a^i + g(f^{abc} A_b^i E_c^i - \psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+) \,, \tag{5.10}$$

$$i\partial^+ \psi_- = (i\alpha_\perp \cdot \partial_\perp + g\alpha_\perp \cdot A_\perp + \beta m)\psi_+ \,. \tag{5.11}$$

Now the light-front QCD Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of the physical degrees of freedom:

$$\begin{aligned} H = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \Big\{ & \frac{1}{2}(\partial^i A_a^j)^2 + g f^{abc} A_a^i A_b^j \partial^i A_c^j + \frac{g^2}{4} f^{abc} f^{ade} A_b^i A_c^j A_d^i A_e^j \\ & + \Big[\psi_+^\dagger \{ \sigma_\perp \cdot (i\partial_\perp + g A_\perp) - im \} \Big(\frac{1}{i\partial^+} \Big) \{ \sigma_\perp \cdot (i\partial_\perp + g A_\perp) + im \} \psi_+ \Big] \\ & + g \partial^i A_a^i \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+} \Big) (f^{abc} A_b^j \partial^+ A_c^j + 2\psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+) \\ & + \frac{g^2}{2} \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+} \Big) (f^{abc} A_b^i \partial^+ A_c^i + 2\psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+) \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+} \Big) \\ & \cdot (f^{ade} A_d^j \partial^+ A_e^j + 2\psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+) \Big\} \\ & + \text{surfaceterms}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ is defined by Eq. (2.16), and the surface terms are given by the last term in Eq. (5.7).

2. A phase space approach to light-front quantization. A self-consistent canonical formulation requires that the resulting Hamiltonian must generate the correct equations of motion for the physical degrees of freedom $(A_a^i, \psi_+, \psi_+^\dagger)$. To reproduce the Lagrangian equations of motion, we need to find consistent commutators for physical field variables. In the light-front gauge, the (symmetricalized) Lagrangian of Eq. (5.6) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial^+ A_a^i \partial^- A_a^i + i\psi_+^\dagger \partial^- \psi_+ - i(\partial^- \psi_+^\dagger)\psi_+) - \mathcal{H}\,. \tag{5.13}$$

Thus the light-front QCD phase space is spanned by the field variables, $A_a^i, \psi_+, \psi_+^\dagger$ and their canonical momenta, $\mathcal{E}_a^i = \frac{1}{2}\partial^+ A_a^i$, $\pi_{\psi_+} = \frac{i}{2}\psi_+^\dagger$, $\pi_{\psi_+^\dagger} = -\frac{i}{2}\psi_+$. The phase space structure which determines the Poisson brackets of its variables can be found by the Lagrangian one-form $\mathcal{L}dx^+$ (apart from a total light-front time derivative),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}dx^+ = & \ \frac{1}{2} 2(\mathcal{E}_a^i dA_a^i + \pi_{\psi_+} d\psi_+ + d\psi_+^\dagger \pi_{\psi_+^\dagger} - A_a^i d\mathcal{E}_a^i - d\pi_{\psi_+}\psi_+ - \psi_+^\dagger d\pi_{\psi_+^\dagger}) \\ & - \mathcal{H}dx^+ \\ = & \ \frac{1}{2} q^\alpha \Gamma_{\alpha\beta} dq^\beta - \mathcal{H}dx^+\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where the first term on the right-hand side is called the canonical one-form of the phase space, and quark fields are anticommuting c-numbers (Grassmann variables). Correspondingly, the symplectic structure or the Poisson bracket of the phase space is given by

$$\omega = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\alpha\beta} dq^\alpha dq^\beta \quad \text{or} \quad [q^\beta, q^\alpha]_p = \Gamma^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\,. \tag{5.15}$$

Canonical quantization is then obtained by replacing the Poisson brackets by the equal-x^+ commutation relations:

$$[q^\beta(x), q^\alpha(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = i\Gamma^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\,. \tag{5.16}$$

Explicitly, we have

$$[A^i_a(x), \mathcal{E}^j_b(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = i\frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}\delta^{ij}\delta^3(x-y)\,, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\{\psi_+(x), \pi_{\psi_+}(y)\}_{x^+=y^+} = i\frac{\Lambda_+}{2}\delta^3(x-y)\,, \tag{5.18}$$

$$\{\psi^\dagger_+(x), \pi_{\psi^\dagger_+}(y)\}_{x^+=y^+} = -i\frac{\Lambda_+}{2}\delta^3(x-y)\,, \tag{5.19}$$

or simply

$$[A^i_a(x), A^j_b(y)]_{x^+=y^+} = -i\frac{\delta_{ab}\delta^{ij}}{4}\epsilon(x^- - y^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - y_\perp)\,, \tag{5.20}$$

$$\{\psi_+(x), \psi^\dagger_+(y)\}_{x^+=y^+} = i\Lambda_+\delta^3(x-y)\,. \tag{5.21}$$

From these commutation relations it is straightforward to verify that the Hamiltonian equations of motion are consistent with Eqs. (5.2) and (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^-\psi_+ =&\ \frac{1}{i}[\psi_+, H] \\
=&\ \Big\{igA^- - \{\alpha_\perp\cdot(i\partial_\perp + gA_\perp) + \beta m\} \\
&\ \cdot\frac{1}{\partial^+}\{\alpha_\perp\cdot(i\partial_\perp + gA_\perp) + \beta m\}\Big\}\psi_+\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^- A^i_a =&\ \frac{1}{i}[A^i_a, H] \\
=&\ \frac{1}{\partial^+}[D^j_{ab}F^{ji}_b - D^i_{ab}E^-_b - gj^i_a - gf^{abc}A^-_b\partial^+A^i_c]\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

where $D^i_{ab} = \delta_{ab}\partial^i - gf^{abc}A^i_c$.

V-2. Light-Front Gauge Singularity

Note that the above canonical formulation does not completely define theory for practical computations due to the existence of the gauge singularity. The gauge singularity is perhaps the most difficult problem in non-abelian gauge theory that has not been completely solved since it was developed. In light-front QCD, it arises from the elimination of

the unphysical gauge degrees of freedom. To eliminate the unphysical degrees of freedom on the light-front, we need to solve the constraint equations which depend on the definition of the operator $1/\partial^+$. In Sec. II, we defined this operator by Eq. (2.16). In general, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right) f(x^-, x^+, x_\perp) = \frac{1}{4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_1^- \varepsilon(x^- - x_1^-) f(x_1^-, x^+, x_\perp) + C(x^+, x_\perp)\,, \tag{5.24}$$

where $\varepsilon(x)$ has been given in Eq. (2.16), and $C(x^+, x_\perp)$ is a x^- independent constant. The reason for choosing the definition of Eq. (2.16) is that the light-front initial value problem is associated with the longitudinal boundary condition. A suitable definition of $1/\partial^+$ can uniquely determine the initial value problem at $x^+ = 0$ for independent field variables [32]. Rohrlich has shown that such a suitable definition is to set $C(x^+, x_\perp) = 0$ [i.e, Eq. (2.16)] [22]. This corresponds to choosing an antisymmetric boundary condition for field variables in the light-front longitudinal direction. I must emphasize here that this is not necessarily the best choice for the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$. As we will see later this definition still causes many undesirable problems associated with the gauge singularity, which even exist in perturbative calculations. It is still an open question whether one can find a better definition to solve the light-front gauge ambiguity in Hamiltonian formalism.

By using Eq. (2.16) and the following identity [149],

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\lambda/2}^{\lambda/2} dx^- \varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\varepsilon(x^- - x''^-) = -|x'^- - x''^-| + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\,, \tag{5.25}$$

where the parameter λ denotes the distance between two boundary points in the longitudinal direction, the constraint gauge and quark components can be determined:

$$E_a^-(x) = -\partial^i A_a^i(x) - \frac{g}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- \varepsilon(x^- x'^-) j_a^+(x^+, x'^-, x_\perp)\,, \tag{5.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_a^-(x) = \; & -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- [\varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\partial^i A_a^i(x^+, x'^-, x_\perp) \\ & + g|x^- - x'^-| j_a^+(x^+, x'^-, x_\perp)] + \left(\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda\right)\frac{g}{4} j_a^+(x^-, x)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_-(x) = \; & -\frac{i}{4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- d^2x'_\perp \varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\delta^2(x_\perp - x'_\perp) \\ & \times[\alpha_\perp \cdot (i\partial'_\perp + gA_\perp(x')) + \beta m]\psi_+(x')\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

where $j_a^+ = 2\psi_+^\dagger T^a \psi_+$. In this solution, the first surface term at the longitudinal infinity in Eq. (5.7) vanishes. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that the transverse color electric fields E_a^i as well as A_a^i vanish as $O(r^{-2})$ and $O(r^{-1})$ at $r = |x_\perp| \to \infty$ because the gauge

freedom is totally fixed at transverse infinity. Thus the second surface term vanishes as well. Now the light-front QCD Hamiltonian is simply given by

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \Big\{ \frac{1}{2}(E_a^{-2} + B_a^{-2}) + \psi_+^\dagger \{\alpha^i (i\partial^i + gA^i) + \beta m\}\psi_- \Big\} \\ = & \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \Big\{ \frac{1}{2}(\partial^i A_a^j)^2 + g f^{abc} A_a^i A_b^j \partial^i A_c^j + \frac{g^2}{4} f^{abc} f^{ade} A_a^i A_b^j A_d^i A_e^j \\ & + \frac{1}{4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- [2g\partial^i A_a^i \varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\rho_a(x'^-, x) \\ & - i\psi_+^\dagger \{\alpha^i (i\partial^i + gA^i) + \beta m\}\varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\{\alpha^j (i\partial^j + gA^j) + \beta m\}\psi_+] \\ & - \frac{g^2}{4}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx'^- \rho_a(x^-, x)|x^- - x'^-|\rho_a(x'^-, x)\Big\} \\ & + \Big(\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda\Big)\frac{g^2}{4}\int d^2x_\perp \Big\{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx^- \rho_a(x^-, x)\Big\}^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

From Eq. (5.29), we see that, after eliminating the longitudinal gauge field in the light-front gauge, a color charge instantaneous interaction emerges in the Hamiltonian, with a linear potential in the longitudinal direction. In addition, Eq. (5.29) also contains a singular boundary term (the last term) associated with the linear instantaneous interaction. There is no such term in the Coulomb gauge because the Coulomb potential vanishes at spatial infinity. This term is very similar to that in the $1+1$ QCD case, as a result of eliminating the unphysical gauge degrees of freedom. However, the role it plays here is totally different from that in 1+1 QCD. As we will show later, in perturbation theory this term is regularized by the distribution function of the product of two principal value prescriptions and leads to the cancellation of the light-front linear infrared divergences. For physical states, the requirement of the finiteness of energy results in asymptotic equations for the transverse gauge fields, which shows that the asymptotic transverse gauge fields do not vanish at longitudinal infinity, as we shall see later.

The gauge singularity manifests itself more clearly in momentum space. In momentum space, the gauge singularity means that the constraints Eqs. (5.8) and (5.9) do not uniquely determine the dependent fields in terms of physical fields at longitudinal momentum $k^+ = 0$. In other words, simply choosing $A_a^+ = 0$ with the definitions of Eq. (2.16) for $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ does not completely fix the gauge degrees of freedom [150]. As we have mentioned many times throughout this paper, the $k^+ = 0$ particles are the constituents leading to a complicated vacuum. From the momentum representation of Eq. (2.16),

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)^n f(x^-) = & \Big(\frac{1}{4}\Big)^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_1^- \cdots dx_n^- \epsilon(x^- - x_1^-)\cdots\epsilon(x_{n-1}^- - x_n^-) f(x_n^-) \\ & \longrightarrow \Big[\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{k^+ + i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{k^+ - i\epsilon}\Big)\Big]^n f(k^+) = \frac{1}{[k^+]^n} f(k^+) . \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

Clearly the $k^+ = 0$ modes are removed with this definition, the singularity of $\frac{1}{k^+}$ is regularized, and the vacuum is guaranteed to be trivial. Of course, the question now is what happens to the nontrivial QCD structure within a trivial vacuum? Unlike the sigma model, here it is not obvious that we can recover the effect of zero modes by the use of a shifting technique. However, although the $k^+ = 0$ singularity is removed by Eq. (2.16), the infrared divergences from the small longitudinal momentum, i.e., surrounding the $k^+ = 0$ region, are still present in the above Hamiltonian. These infrared divergences are hidden in the three point quark-gluon and gluon-gluon vertices, and are associated with the QCD vacuum properties. Recently, Wilson pointed out that, due to the different structure of the light front power counting, we can introduce noncanonical counterterms to remove the light-front infrared divergences [152] in light-front QCD, as we will discuss later. These counterterms may be the sources of the nontrivial vacuum effect. In order to understand the behavior of infrared divergences, we will first discuss how they occur in perturbation computations.

V-3. Perturbative Light-Front QCD

The light-front gauge singularity discussed above will lead to severe divergences even in perturbation theory, although Eq. (2.16) provides a well-defined regulator (a generalized principal value prescription, Eq. (5.30)) for the small k^+ momentum. In Feynman's perturbation theory, the use of the principal value prescription still leads to "spurious" poles in the light-front Feynman integrals, which prohibit any continuation to Euclidean space (Wick rotation) and hence the use of standard power counting arguments for Feynman loop integrals [59]. This causes difficulties in addressing renormalization of QCD in Feynman perturbation theory with the light-front gauge. In the last decade there are many investigations attempting to solve this problem. One excellent solution is given by Mandelstam and Leibbrandt, i.e., the Mandelstam-Leibbrandt (ML) prescription [57,58], which allows continuation to Euclidean space and hence power counting. It has also been shown that, with the ML prescription, the *multiplicative* renormalization in the two-component light-front QCD Feynman formulation is restored [60].

Unfortunately, the ML prescription cannot be applied to equal-x^+ quantization because the ML prescription is defined by a boundary condition which depends on x^+ itself [151] and is not allowed in equal-x^+ canonical theory. Yet, as was pointed out recently by Wilson [152], light-front power counting differs completely from the power counting in equal-time quantization in that noncanonical counterterms are allowed in light-front field theory. In other words, multiplicative renormalization is not required in light-front QCD. Furthermore, the current attempts to understand nonperturbative QCD in light-front coordinates is based on the x^+-ordered (old-fashioned) diagrams in which no Feynman integral is involved. Thus the power counting criterion for Feynman loop integrals is no longer

available in light-front QCD Hamiltonian calculations. In Hamiltonian perturbation theory with the principle value prescription, light-front QCD contains severe linear and logarithmic infrared divergences. Here I will give some results from the x^+-ordered perturbative loop calculations and renormalization of light-front QCD Hamiltonian theory up to one-loop [82,148], where the infrared divergences are systematically analyzed. Since light-front power counting allows noncanonical counterterms, a complete understanding of renormalized light-front QCD may not be worked out within perturbation theory; new renormalization and regularization approaches need to be developed, which we will discuss in the next section.

The following calculations are performed in the formulation of the light-front Hamiltonian perturbation theory with a two-component representation [82]. The light-front QCD Hamiltonian can be rewritten as a free term plus interactions,

$$H = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp (\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{int}) = H_0 + H_I \,. \tag{5.31}$$

It is easy to show that

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\partial^i A_a^j)(\partial^i A_a^j) + \varphi^\dagger \Big(\frac{-\nabla^2 + m^2}{i\partial^+} \Big) \varphi \,, \tag{5.32}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{int} = \mathcal{H}_{qqg} + \mathcal{H}_{ggg} + \mathcal{H}_{qqgg} + \mathcal{H}_{qqqq} + \mathcal{H}_{gggg} \,, \tag{5.33}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{qqg} = \; & g\varphi^\dagger \Big\{ -2\Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\partial \cdot A_\perp) + \sigma \cdot A_\perp \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\sigma \cdot \partial_\perp + m) \\ & + \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\sigma \cdot \partial_\perp - m)\sigma \cdot A_\perp \Big\} \varphi \,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{ggg} = g f^{abc} \Big\{ \partial^i A_a^j A_b^i A_c^j + (\partial^i A_a^i) \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(A_b^j \partial^+ A_c^j) \Big\} \,, \tag{5.35}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{qqgg} = \; & g^2 \Big\{ \varphi^\dagger \sigma \cdot A_\perp \Big(\frac{1}{i\partial^+}\Big) \sigma \cdot A_\perp \varphi \\ & + 2\Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(f^{abc} A_b^i \partial^+ A_c^i) \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\varphi^\dagger T^a \varphi) \Big\} \\ = \; & \mathcal{H}_{qqgg1} + \mathcal{H}_{qqgg2} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{qqqq} = 2g^2 \Big\{ \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\varphi^\dagger T^a \varphi) \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(\varphi^\dagger T^a \varphi) \Big\} \,, \tag{5.37}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{gggg} = \; & \frac{g^2}{4} f^{abc} f^{ade} \Big\{ A_b^i A_c^j A_d^i A_e^j + 2\Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(A_b^i \partial^+ A_c^i) \Big(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\Big)(A_d^j \partial^+ A_e^j) \Big\} \\ = \; & \mathcal{H}_{gggg1} + \mathcal{H}_{gggg2} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

where φ is the light-front fermion two-component representation (see Eq. (2.34) discussed in Sec. II).

The x^+-ordered light-front QCD perturbative theory can be obtained from the familiar perturbation expansion in quantum mechanics. The perturbation expansion of a bound state is given by (in the Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory):

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Big(\frac{Q}{E_0 - H_0} (H_I') \Big)^n |\Phi\rangle \,, \tag{5.39}$$

where $|\Phi\rangle$ is a unperturbative state, Q and H_I' are defined by:

$$Q = |\Phi\rangle\langle\Psi| \,, \qquad H_I' = H_I - \Delta E \,, \qquad \Delta E = \langle\Phi|H_I|\Psi\rangle \,. \tag{5.40}$$

With this perturbative expansion formula, the mass, wave functions, and coupling constants renormalizations can be expressed as follows. For the convenience of practical calculations, we consider the expressions in momentum space.

i). *Wavefunction renormalization*: In momentum space, the perturbative expansion of a state is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle = \; & \Big\{ |\Phi\rangle + {\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I'|\Phi\rangle}{p^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon} \\ & + {\sum_{n_1 n_2}}' \frac{|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I'|n_2\rangle\langle n_2|H_I'|\Phi\rangle}{(p^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon)(p^- - p_{n_2}^- + i\epsilon)} + \cdots \Big\} \,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

which has not been normalized, where $|n_1\rangle, |n_2\rangle, \cdots$ are properly symmetrized (antisymmetrized) states with respect to identical bosons (fermions) in the states and $\sum'$ in Eq. (5.41) sums over all intermediate states except the initial state $|\Phi\rangle$. The normalized wave function is defined by $|\Psi'\rangle = \sqrt{Z_\Phi}|\Psi\rangle$, where the factor Z_Φ is the wavefunction renormalization constant:

$$Z_\Phi^{-1} = \langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle = 1 + {\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{|\langle n_1|H_I'|\Phi\rangle|^2}{(p^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon)^2} + \cdots \,. \tag{5.42}$$

ii). *Mass renormalization*. The mass correction can then be computed from the "energy-level" shift, i.e., the correction to the energy of an on-mass-shell particle. It is obvious that the perturbative correction to the light-front energy (p^-) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p^- &= \langle\Phi|(H - H_0)|\Psi\rangle = \langle\Phi|H_I|\Psi\rangle \\ &= \langle\Phi|H_I|\Phi\rangle + {\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{|\langle n_1|H_I|\Phi\rangle|^2}{p^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon} + \cdots \,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.43}$$

Using the mass-shell equation $m^2 = p^+p^- - \mathbf{p}_\perp^2$, and recalling that p^+ and $\mathbf{p}_\perp$ are the conserved light-front kinematical momenta, we obtain the mass renormalization in the old-fashioned perturbative light-front field theory:

$$\delta m^2 = p^+\delta p^- = p^+\langle\Phi|H_I|\Phi\rangle + p^+{\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{|\langle n_1|H_I|\Phi\rangle|^2}{p^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon} + \cdots . \tag{5.44}$$

iii). *Coupling constant renormalization.* The coupling constant renormalization is obtained by the perturbative calculation of various matrix elements of the vertices in H_I. Consider a vertex H_I^i that is proportional to the coupling constant g, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\Psi_f'|H_I^i|\Psi_i'\rangle &\equiv Z_g\sqrt{Z_iZ_f}\,\langle\Psi_f|H_I^i|\Psi_i\rangle \\
&= \langle\Phi_f|H_I^i|\Phi_i\rangle + {\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{\langle\Phi_f|H_I'|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I^i|\Psi_i\rangle}{p_f^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon} \\
&\quad + {\sum_{n_1}}' \frac{\langle\Phi_f|H_I^i|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I'|\Psi_i\rangle}{p_i^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon} \\
&\quad + {\sum_{n_1,n_2}}' \frac{\langle\Phi_f|H_I'|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I'|n_2\rangle\langle n_2|H_I^i]|\Phi_i\rangle}{(p_f^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon)(p_f^- - p_{n_2}^- + i\epsilon)} \\
&\quad + {\sum_{n_1,n_2}}' \frac{\langle\Phi_f|H_I'|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I^i|n_2\rangle\langle n_2|H_I']|\Phi_i\rangle}{(p_f^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon)(p_i^- - p_{n_2}^- + i\epsilon)} \\
&\quad + {\sum_{n_1,n_2}}' \frac{\langle\Phi_f|H_I^i|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|H_I'|n_2\rangle\langle n_2|H_I']|\Phi_i\rangle}{(p_i^- - p_{n_1}^- + i\epsilon)(p_i^- - p_{n_2}^- + i\epsilon)} + \cdots ,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

where Z_g is the multiplicative coupling constant renormalization, and Z_i and Z_f are the wavefunction renormalization constants of the initial and final states.

It is also convenient to express the above perturbation expansion in terms of the diagrammatic approach. All matrix elements of H_I^i for the light-front QCD vertices are listed in Table II with the corresponding diagrams. These are obtained by directly calculating the matrix elements between free particle states. The rules for writing the expression of perturbative expansions from diagrams are as follows:

- Draw all topologically distinct x^+-ordered diagrams.
- For each internal line, sum over helicity and integrate using $\int \frac{dk^+d^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3}\theta(k^+)$ for quarks and $\int \frac{dk^+d^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3k^+}\theta(k^+)$ for gluons.
- For each vertex, include a factor of $16\pi^3\delta^3(p_f - p_i)$ and a simple matrix element listed in Table I.
- Include a factor $(p_i^- - \sum_n p_n^- + i\epsilon)^{-1}$ [or $(p_f^- - \sum_n p_n^- + i\epsilon)^{-1}$] for each intermediate state, where $\sum_n p_n^-$ sum over all on-mass-shell intermediate particle energies.

TABLE II. The x^+-ordered Hamiltonian Diagrammatic Rules

- Add a symmetry factor S^{-1} for each gluon loop coming from the symmetrized boson states.

To illustrate the above computation scheme and to see the severe light-front infrared divergences, let me list some calculations up to one-loop based on the x^+-ordered diagrammatical approach.

i). *Quark wavefunction and mass renormalization.* Besides the infrared divergence, which is regularized by Eq. (5.30), there are also ultraviolet divergences for which we use a transverse cut-off regularization: $|\kappa_\perp| \leq \Lambda_\perp$. For this simplest regularization scheme the one-loop light-front quark energy corrections (for the three diagrams in Fig. 5, respectively) are

$$\begin{aligned}\delta p_1^- = & -\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}C_f\Big\{\frac{p^2-m^2}{[p^+]}\Big[\Big(2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}-\frac{3}{2}\Big)\ln\Lambda_\perp^2 \\ & -\int_0^1 dx\Big(\frac{2}{[x]}-2+x\Big)\ln f(x)\Big] \\ & +\frac{m^2}{[p^+]}\Big(-2\ln\Lambda_\perp^2+2\int_0^1 dx\ln f(x)\Big) \\ & +\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[p^+]}\Big(\frac{\pi p^+}{2\epsilon}-1+\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\Big)\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

FIG. 5. The x^+-ordered graphs for the one-loop correction to the quark mass and wave function renormalization.

$$\delta p_2^- = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} C_f \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[p^+]} \ln \frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\,, \quad \delta p_3^- = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} C_f \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[p^+]} \left(\frac{\pi p^+}{2\epsilon} - 1 \right), \tag{5.47}$$

where $f(x) = (xm^2 - x(1-x)p^2)$. This shows that, in the one-loop quark energy correction, one-gluon exchange gives rise to both linear and logarithmic infrared divergences. The instantaneous fermion interaction contribution (see δp_2^- in Fig. 5b) contains only one logarithmic divergence which cancels the logarithmic divergence in δp_1^-. The instantaneous gluon interaction contribution (δp_3^- of Fig. 5c) has a linear infrared divergence which precisely cancels the same divergence in δp_1^-. This cancellation of linear infrared divergences is based on the use of the regularization for $k^+ \to 0$ in Eq. (5.30) [82].

The quark mass correction (dropping the finite part) is then given by

$$\delta m^2 = p^+ \delta p^-|_{p^2=m^2} = \frac{g^2}{4\pi^2} C_f m^2 \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{m^2}\,, \tag{5.48}$$

which is longitudinally infrared divergence free; and the quark wavefunction renormalization constant is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_2 = &\ 1 + \frac{\partial \delta p^-}{\partial p^-}\bigg|_{p^2=m^2} \\ = &\ 1 + \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} C_f \left\{ \left(\frac{3}{2} - 2 \ln \frac{p^+}{\epsilon} \right) \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{m^2} + 2 \ln \frac{p^+}{\epsilon} \left(1 - \ln \frac{p^+}{\epsilon} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.49}$$

The wavefunction renormalization contains an additional type of divergence, the mixing of infrared and ultraviolet divergences, that does not occur in covariant calculations. This is the 'spurious' mixing associated with the gauge singularity. It corresponds to the so-called light-front double pole problem in the Feynman theory with the use of the light-front gauge and the principal value prescription that prohibits any continuation to Euclidean space and power counting in Feynman loop integrals. In the x^+-ordered Hamiltonian perturbative theory the power counting is different. The above argument of power counting for Feynman loop integrals may be irrelevant. Furthermore, since the second order correction

FIG. 6. The x^+-ordered graphs for the one-loop correction to the gluon mass and wave function renormalization.

to wavefunctions must be negative [see Eq. (5.42)], Eq. (5.49) shows that it is the additional infrared divergence that gives a consistent answer for wavefunction renormalization.

ii). *Gluon wave function and mass correction.* The one-loop light-front gluon energy corrections are given by (see Fig. 6)

$$\begin{aligned}\delta q_1^- = & -\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}C_A\Big\{\frac{q^2}{[q^+]}\Big[\Big(2\ln\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}-\frac{11}{6}\Big)\ln\Lambda_\perp^2 \\ & +\int_0^1 dx\Big(2-x(1-x)-\frac{2}{[x]}\Big)\ln(x(1-x)q^2)\Big]+\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[q^+]}\frac{\pi q^+}{2\epsilon}\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta q_2^- = & -\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}T_f N_f\Big\{\frac{q^2}{[q^+]}\Big[\frac{2}{3}\ln\Lambda_\perp^2 \\ & -\int_0^1 dx(2x^2-2x+1)\ln(m^2-x(1-x)q^2)\Big] \\ & +\frac{m^2}{[q^+]}\Big[2\ln\Lambda_\perp^2-2\int_0^1 dx\ln(m^2-x(1-x)q^2)\Big] \\ & +2\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[q^+]}\Big(\ln\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}-1\Big)\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.51}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta q_3^- &= -\frac{g^2}{4\pi^2}\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[q^+]}T_f N_f \ln\frac{k_\infty^+}{q^+}\,,\\ \delta q_4^- &= \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}C_A\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[q^+]}\left\{\frac{\pi q^+}{2\epsilon}-1+\ln\frac{k_\infty^+}{\epsilon}\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.52}$$

$$\delta q_5^- = \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2}C_A\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{[q^+]}\ln\frac{k_\infty^+}{\epsilon}\,, \tag{5.53}$$

where k_∞^+ is the internal fermion momentum $k^+ \to \infty$. In Eq. (5.50), there is also a mass singularity, which is well known in gauge theory and which is usually regularized by introducing a small gluon mass ($q^2 = \mu_G^2$) in the energy denominators. The gluon mass and wavefunction renormalizations are

$$\delta\mu_G^2 = -\frac{g^2}{4\pi^2}\left\{T_f N_f m^2\ln\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{m^2}\Lambda_\perp^2\left(\frac{C_A}{2}-T_f N_f\right)\left(1-\ln\frac{k_\infty^+}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}, \tag{5.54}$$

$$\begin{aligned}Z_3 = \;& 1+\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left\{\left(\frac{11}{6}-2\ln\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}\right)C_A\ln\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{\mu_G^2}-\frac{2}{3}T_f N_f\ln\frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{m^2}\right.\\ & \left.-2C_A\ln^2\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.55}$$

All severe divergences appear in the gluon sector: quadratic and logarithmic UV divergences, linear and logarithmic IR divergences, a gluon mass singularity and an unusual large longitudinal momentum logarithmic divergence. Only the linear infrared divergences are cancelled with the principal value prescription. The gluon mass correction is not zero. The first term in (5.54) is a fermion loop contribution (Fig. 6b), which is the same as the photon mass correction in QED. In addition, the gluon mass correction also contains a severe mixing of the quadratic UV divergences with the logarithmic IR and UV divergences of the longitudinal momentum. It is caused by the instantaneous fermion and gluon interaction contributions plus the tadpole effect of the normal four gluon interactions (Fig. 6c-6e). This kind of divergence behaves in the same way from both the fermion contribution and the gluon contribution. The non-zero gluon mass correction of Eq. (5.54) is not surprising because it has the same divergence feature as the photon mass correction in light-front QED [Eq. (5.54) will be reduced to the photon mass correction when we set $T_f = 1$, $C_A = 0$ and $N_f = 1$]. In a covariant calculation, the zero gluon mass correction is true only for dimensional regularization which "removes" or drops the mass correction. In the present calculation, maintaining zero gluon mass requires a mass counterterm, as is known in QED. The difference between QED and QCD is only manifest in the gauge boson wavefunction renormalization. For wavefunction renormalization, again there is an additional mixing of UV and IR divergences, which provides the correct sign for the wavefunction renormalization constant. Besides this feature, there is a contribution from the gluon loop (Fig. 6a).

As we will see in the following, after the cancellation of the mixing divergences, it is this contribution that leads to asymptotic freedom in QCD.

However, the above calculations show that the wave function renormalization contains several complicated pure infrared divergences and a mass singularity from the massless gluon. This complexity can be avoided if we introduce a mass scale μ for the minimum cut-off for the transverse momentum:

$$\Lambda_\perp^2 \geq \kappa_\perp^2 \geq \mu^2 \,, \tag{5.56}$$

and assume that μ is much larger than all other masses in the theory. With this regulator, the quark and gluon mass and wavefunction renormalizations become simple,

$$\delta m^2 = \frac{g^2}{4\pi^2} C_f m^2 \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{\mu^2} \,, \tag{5.57}$$

$$\delta\mu_G^2 = -\frac{g^2}{4\pi^2}\left\{ T_f N_f m^2 \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{\mu^2} (\Lambda_\perp^2 - \mu^2)\left(\frac{C_A}{2} - T_f N_f\right)\left(1 - \ln \frac{k_\infty^+}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}, \tag{5.58}$$

$$Z_2 = 1 + \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} C_f \left(\frac{3}{2} - 2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\right) \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{\mu^2} \,, \tag{5.59}$$

$$Z_3 = 1 + \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left\{ C_A\left(\frac{11}{6} - 2\ln\frac{q^+}{\epsilon}\right) - \frac{2}{3} T_f N_f \right\} \ln \frac{\Lambda_\perp^2}{\mu^2} \,. \tag{5.60}$$

This shows that all the pure infrared divergences in the wavefunction renormalizations are removed. The remaining unfamiliar divergences are the mixing of quadratic UV with logarithmic IR divergences in the gluon mass correction, and the mixing of UV and IR logarithmic divergences in the wavefunction renormalizations. The mixing divergences in the gluon mass correction could be removed by a gluon mass counterterm, while the mixing divergences in the wavefunction renormalizations are cancelled in physical quantities. This can be seen from the coupling constant renormalization.

iii). *Coupling constant renormalization.* For convenience, we set the external gluon momentum $q(q^+, q_\perp^i) = 0$. The quark-gluon vertex is then reduced:

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = 2g T^a_{\beta\alpha} \frac{p^i}{p^+} \delta_{\lambda_1\lambda_2} \varepsilon_\sigma^{i*} \,. \tag{5.61}$$

In x^+-ordered perturbation theory, the one-loop vertex correction is given by

$$\delta\mathcal{V}_0 = \{V_1 + V_2 + V_3 + V_4 + V_5 + V_6\}\mathcal{V}_0 \,, \tag{5.62}$$

where V_n, $n = 1 - 6$ are represented by Fig. 7.

$$V_1 = \frac{g^2}{2\pi^2}\left(\frac{3}{2} - 2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\right) C_f \ln\frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \,, \tag{5.63}$$

FIG. 7. The x^+-ordered graphs for the one-loop correction to the quark-gluon vectex renormalization.

$$V_2 = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left(\frac{11}{3}C_A - \frac{4}{3}N_f T_f\right), \tag{5.64}$$

$$V_3 = -\frac{g^2}{4\pi^2}\left(\frac{3}{2} - 2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\right)\left(-\frac{1}{2}C_A + C_f\right)\ln\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}, \tag{5.65}$$

$$V_4 = -\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left(\frac{3}{2} - 2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon}\right)C_A \ln\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}, \tag{5.66}$$

$$V_5 = 0, \qquad V_6 = 0. \tag{5.67}$$

To evaluate the contributions to the coupling constant we have to multiply V_1 and V_2 by $\frac{1}{2}$ in order to take into account the proper correction due to the renormalization of initial and final states [153,154]. Thus adding the contributions together, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{V}_0 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}V_1 + \frac{1}{2}V_2 + V_2 + V_4 + V_5 + V_6\right)\mathcal{V}_0 \\ &= \mathcal{V}_0\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left(\frac{11}{6}C_A - \frac{2}{3}N_f T_f\right)\ln\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.68}$$

Note that all mixed divergences cancel now. The correction to the coupling constant is given by

$$g_R = g(1+\delta g) = g\left\{1 + \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left(\frac{11}{6}C_A - \frac{2}{3}N_f T_f\right)\ln\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right\}. \tag{5.69}$$

By redefining the bare coupling constant g such that g_R is finite. Thus we have given all renormalization quantities in QCD up to one-loop order based on the old-fashioned Hamiltonian perturbation theory.

From these results, the anomalous dimensions for quarks and gluons and the β function up to one-loop can be easily calculated. The anomalous dimension of the quark field to order g^2 is

$$\gamma_F \equiv -\frac{1}{2Z_2}\frac{\partial Z_2}{\partial \ln\Lambda} = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}C_f\left(2\ln\frac{p^+}{\epsilon} - \frac{3}{2}\right). \tag{5.70}$$

The momentum-dependent term implies that the quark anomalous dimension is gauge dependent. The anomalous dimension for the gluon field is

$$\gamma_G \equiv -\frac{1}{2Z_3}\frac{\partial Z_3}{\partial \ln\Lambda} = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\left\{C_f\left(2\ln\frac{q^+}{\epsilon} - \frac{11}{6}\right) + \frac{2}{3}T_f N_f\right\}, \tag{5.71}$$

which is also gauge-dependent. In the case of $q^+ = 0$, the gauge dependent term can be removed, and Eq. (5.71) is reduced to Gross and Wilczek's result in their Feynman calculation with $A_a^+ = 0$ and $q^+ = 0$ [42]. The β function is

$$\beta(g) = -\frac{\partial g_R}{\partial \ln\Lambda} = -\frac{g^3}{16\pi^2}\left(\frac{11}{3}C_A - \frac{4}{3}N_f T_f\right), \tag{5.72}$$

which is the well-known result to one loop order and is infrared divergence free, as we expected.

From the above result, we see that there are severe light-front divergences in light-front QCD. Systematic control of these divergences is required *a priori* before we perform any practical numerical calculation in light-front coordinates for QCD bound states. From the basic one-loop calculations, one can see that, in the old-fashioned perturbation theory, light-front QCD involves various UV and IR divergences. Some of the divergences have not even been encountered in covariant and noncovariant Feynman calculations to the same order. Among various light-front divergences, there are two severe divergences one has to deal with in the old-fashioned theory for light-front QCD. The first is the mixing of UV and IR logarithmic divergences in wavefunction renormalization. The occurrence of the mixing divergences may not be a severe problem. The mixing divergences should be cancelled completely for physical quantities, as we have seen from the coupling constant renormalization. We expect that the problem of mixing divergences may not exist when we consider real physical processes. The second problem is the infinite gluon mass correction. In the old-fashioned Hamiltonian theory dimensional regularization is not available to avoid the nonzero gluon mass correction. To have a massless gluon in perturbation theory, we have to introduce a gluon mass counterterm. In the leading order (one-loop) calculation, there is no difficulty arising from a gluon mass counterterm. However, when we go to the next order, it has been found that the gluon mass counterterm leads to a noncancellation of infrared divergences. The non-vanishing infrared divergences could introduce non-local counterterms in both the longitudinal and transverse directions. In equal-time quantization, such non-local counterterms are forbidden for a renormalizable theory. Here, these non-local counterterms are allowed by the light-front power counting. This is a special feature of light-front QCD. One speculation from this property is that the non-local counterterms for infrared divergences may also provide a source for quark confinement [85].

In summary, renormalization in *light-front QCD Hamiltonian theory* is very different from conventional Feynman theory and it is an entirely new subject where investigations are still in their preliminary stage. In perturbative calculations, careful treatment could remove all severe infrared divergences for interesting physical quantities in light-front QCD. For nonperturbative studies, the cancellation of severe infrared divergences may not work because certain approximations (e.g., Fock space truncation) might be used. These approximations may also break many important symmetries such as gauge invariance and rotational invariance. It is the hope of the current investigation of light-front renormalization theory that the counterterms for the light-front infrared divergences may restore the broken symmetries and also provide an effective confining light-front QCD Hamiltonian for hadronic bound states.

V-4. Infrared Divergences and Nontrivial QCD Properties

Before we go on to discuss a possible approach to the nonperturbative dynamics of light-front QCD, I would like to further address the infrared singularity and its relation with the nontrivial structure of QCD on the light-front [150].

The infrared divergences arise from the elimination of the unphysical gauge degrees of freedom. In coordinate space, infrared divergences are associated with the singularity at longitudinal infinity. For physical states, finite energy density requires that the longitudinal color electric field strength must vanish at the longitudinal boundary:

$$E_a^-|_{x^-=\pm\infty} = 0\,, \tag{5.73}$$

which is a condition to canonically remove the light-front infrared divergences and which leads to a constraint on the A_a^i at longitudinal infinity:

$$\partial^i A_a^i|_{x^-=\pm\infty} = \mp\frac{g}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx^- j_a^+(x^-,x)\,. \tag{5.74}$$

Eq. (5.74) is consistent with the choice of antisymmetric boundary condition from the definition of Eq. (2.16). Clearly, Eq. (5.74) is satisfied only for physical states. In perturbation theory, we cannot use this condition because in perturbative QCD we consider not only physical states but also color non-singlet states for which Eq. (5.74) may not be satisfied. Therefore, the main effect of Eq. (5.74) should be manifested in nonperturbative dynamics, i.e., bound states. To address hadronic bound states, the existence of nontrivial structure, namely, confinement potentials and the mechanism of dynamical chiral symmetry breaking, is crucial. An explicit derivation of such nontrivial properties from QCD is still lacking. Here I will show how Eq. (5.74) can really influence the nontrivial properties of QCD.

i). *Topological winding number.* Let us consider the axial current equation (for zero quark mass)

$$\partial_\mu j_5^\mu = N_f\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(F_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu})\,, \tag{5.75}$$

where the axial current is $j_5^\mu = \bar\psi\gamma^\mu\gamma_5\psi$, and the dual field strength is $\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}F_{\sigma\rho}$. The winding number in light-front QCD is defined as the net charge between $x^+ = -\infty$ and $x^+ = \infty$,

$$\Delta Q_5 = N_f\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2}\int_M d^4x\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(F_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu})\,. \tag{5.76}$$

The integration on the r.h.s. of the above equation is defined in Minkowski space (M) and can be replaced by a surface integral. It has been found [150] that

$$\Delta Q_5 = -N_f\frac{g^2}{\pi^2}\int dx^+ d^2x_\perp\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(A^-[A^1,A^2])\Big|_{x^-=-\infty}^{x^-=\infty}\,, \tag{5.77}$$

where $A_a^-|_{x=\pm\infty}$ is determined by Eq. (5.27). We see that a non-vanishing ΔQ_5 is generated from the asymptotic fields of A_a^i, A_a^- and their antisymmetric boundary conditions at longitudinal infinity.

For physical states, it is particularly interesting to see from Eq. (5.74) that the asymptotic physical gauge fields are generated by the color charge densities integrated over x^-. Thus, the topological winding number in the $A_a^+ = 0$ gauge can be explicitly explored from Eq. (5.74).

ii). *Non-local interactions in the transverse direction.* From Eq. (5.74) we see that the asymptotic A_a^i fields at the longitudinal boundary are proportional to the color charge density in the transverse space and also that they involve non-local behavior in the transverse direction (induced by the transverse derivative). Intuitively, we may separate the transverse gauge potentials into a normal part plus a boundary part,

$$A_a^i = A_{aN}^i + A_{aB}^i \,, \tag{5.78}$$

where

$$A_{aN}^i|_{x^-=\pm\infty} = 0 \,, \qquad \partial^i A_{aN}^i|_{x^-=\pm\infty} = 0 \,, \tag{5.79}$$

$$\partial^i A_{aB}^i|_{x^-=\pm\infty} = \mp\frac{g}{2}(\rho_a^g(x_\perp) + \rho_a^q(x_\perp)) \,. \tag{5.80}$$

In Eq. (5.80), $\rho_a(x_\perp)$ denotes the color charge densities integrated over x^-. The conditions of Eqs. (5.79) and (5.80) do not uniquely determine the separation of Eq. (5.78). Generally, there are two types of separation for Eq. (5.78). One, is to consider A_{aB}^i the long-distance fields generated by the boundary integrals and A_{aN}^i the short-distance fields determined by free theory. In this case, if we are only interested in the low-energy dynamics, the effect of the A_{aN}^i fields may be ignored. This separation is physically very interesting but it is practically very difficult to realise analytically. Another possibility is to choose a simple solution for the A_{aB}^i that satisfies Eq. (5.80). In this case, the A_{aN}^i have the trivial boundary condition, Eq. (5.79), but are not determined by the free theory. The Hamiltonian is then expressed only in terms of the A_{aN}^i and the boundary behavior of transverse gauge fields is replaced by the effective interactions. A convenient choice for A_{aB}^i which satisfies Eq. (5.80) is

$$A_{aB}^i(x) = -\frac{g}{8}\int dx'^- dx'^i \varepsilon(x^- - x'^-)\varepsilon(x^i - x'^i)(\rho_a^g(x') + \rho_a^q(x'))\,, \quad i = 1,2\,. \tag{5.81}$$

With such a formal solution, we obtain a new Hamiltonian in terms of A_{aN}^i that contains many effective interactions induced by Eq. (5.74). All these effective interactions involve the color charge densities and involve non-local behavior in both the longitudinal and transverse

directions. One of the lowest order interactions, for example, is given by

$$H_{b1} \propto \sum_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx^i dx^- dx^j dx'^- dx'^j \eta^{ij} \times \{\partial^i \rho_a^q(x^-, x^i, x^j)\} |x^- - x'^-| |x^j - x'^j| \{\partial^i \rho_a^q(x'^-, x^i, x'^j)\}, \tag{5.82}$$

where $\eta^{ij} \equiv 1(0)$ for $i \neq (=)j$. This is a linear interaction in both the longitudinal and the transverse directions. Hence, Eq. (5.74) leads to numerous many-body non-local color charge interactions which may lead to confinement.

Still the Hamiltonian contains, in principle, an infinite number of many-body interactions generated by the boundary integrals (or obtained from the counterterms of the infrared divergences). This is a consequence of the boundary integrals in a non-abelian gauge theory due to the existence of nonlinear gluon interactions. It is also true in other gauge choices, such as the Coulomb gauge [155] or the axial gauge [157]. Practically, we do not know how to solve for hadrons from such a complicated QCD Hamiltonian. Nevertheless, in the light-front QCD, one can set the vacuum to be trivial, the nontrivial QCD features for physical states are switched to the field operators and are manifested in the asymptotic behavior of physical gauge fields at longitudinal infinity. The trivial vacuum with nontrivial field variables in light-front QCD may provide a practical framework for describing hadrons. In the next two sections, we will explore these problems from a totally different point of view.

VI. LIGHT-FRONT RENORMALIZATION

As I mentioned in the very beginning, the theory of nonperturbative QCD (at the hadronic scale) has indeed not been defined at the present time. What I mean is that since we do not know how to renormalize QCD nonperturbatively, all results we obtain (if we can calculate) may have nothing to do with the data observed in various experiments. In other words, the bare structure of QCD (or a field theory) does not directly connect to the real hadronic world although it is constructed from the beautiful requirement of various symmetries. Without knowing precisely the renormalization scheme for a field theory, the theory itself has not indeed been defined.

One may argue that since we even do not know what is nonperturbative field theory, how can we talk about nonperturbative renormalization. It is true that there is no clear description in most field theory text books of nonperturbative field theory. However, quantum field theory is developed within the framework of quantum mechanics which is defined nonperturbatively in terms of the Hamiltonian formalism. From the descriptions in the previous sections, we have seen that light-front field theory can be formulated as an ordinary quantum mechanical system. This may provide a possible way to establish a non-

perturbative field theory for relativistic dynamics on the light-front, as we have emphasized throughout this paper.

In this section, I will discuss a new renormalization scheme for Hamiltonian systems that was developed recently [83-85]. It begins with the light-front power counting plus a cutoff scheme on the constituents to construct the basic structure of the QCD Hamiltonian, then using a similarity renormalization approach to remove the cutoff dependence. The renormalized theory is given by an effective Hamiltonian that is characterized by a scale parameter. It demands that when the scale is taken at the hadronic energy level, the theory should produce all the physics of the hadrons. When the scale is far from the hadronic scale, the theory must reproduce all the results of perturbative QCD.

VI-1. Light-Front Power Counting: Canonical Structure

Before discussing renormalization, I would like to introduce the light-front power counting rules which determine the possible structure of operators for the canonical Hamiltonian [85].

Light-front power counting is done in terms of the longitudinal coordinate x^- and the transverse coordinate $x_\perp$. The power counting analysis is to deduce the most general structure of divergences that arises from increasing the powers of the interaction Hamiltonian in perturbation theory. But power counting based on the kinematical symmetries of the light front is different from power counting based on the kinematical symmetries in equal-time coordinates. This is immediately transparent from the light-front dispersion relation for free particles, $k^- = \frac{k_\perp^2+m^2}{k^+}$. Because the energy separates the k^+ and $k_\perp$ dependencies, the subtractions are not constants. For example, when $k_\perp$ gets very large the energy diverges no matter what k^+ is. Thus, in general, we get a divergent constant *multiplied by a function of* k^+. In position space this translates into divergences at small $x_\perp$ being nonlocal in x^- and spread out over the light front. A similar result follows for the case when k^+ gets very small. It does scale differently under x^-- and $x_\perp$-scaling (strictly speaking, a unique transverse scaling behavior holds only in the absence of masses). This situation is to be contrasted with the equal-time case where the relationship between energy and momentum in the equal-time theory is $E = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m^2}$. In this equal-time form, if $k_\perp \to \infty$ while k_z is fixed, the k_z dependence becomes negligible and arbitrary functions of k_z cannot arise.

i). *Power counting analysis and canonical light-front QCD Hamiltonian.* The scaling properties of the canonical Hamiltonian is determined as follows. From the canonical commutation relations (5.20) and (5.21), under the scale transformation $x^- \to x'^- = sx^-, x_\perp \to x'_\perp = tx_\perp$, one can find the power assignments for the field variables

$$A_\perp : \frac{1}{x_\perp}, \qquad \xi : \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^-}}\frac{1}{x_\perp}. \tag{6.1}$$

The power assignments for the derivatives is obvious:

$$\partial_\perp : \frac{1}{x_\perp}\,, \qquad \partial^+ : \frac{1}{x^-}\,, \qquad \frac{1}{\partial^+} : x^-\,. \tag{6.2}$$

From the light-front dispersion relation, we see that the Hamiltonian $H = P^-$ scales just like $x^-/x_\perp^2$,

$$H : \frac{x^-}{x_\perp^2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H} : \frac{1}{x_\perp^4}\,, \qquad m : \frac{1}{x_\perp}\,, \tag{6.3}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ and m are the Hamiltonian density and the mass parameter. Note that under scale transformations masses scale as constants. Thus the Hamiltonian does not have a unique scaling behavior when masses are present. Here the mass is assigned a power only based on dimensional analysis.

The canonical light-front QCD Hamiltonian density is a polynomial in the six components m, $A_\perp$, ξ, ∂^+, $\partial_\perp$, and $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$. The most general structure we can build for the canonical Hamiltonian density, which has dimension $\frac{1}{(x_\perp)^4}$, is

$$(\xi\xi^\dagger)^p(A_\perp, \partial_\perp, m)^{4-2p}(\partial^+)^{-p}\,. \tag{6.4}$$

Here the expression $(A_\perp, \partial_\perp, m)^{4-2p}$ stands for monomials of order $4-2p$ in any combination of the three variables $A_\perp, \partial_\perp, m$, which immediately shows that the allowed values of p are $0, 1, 2$. The resulting canonical QCD Hamiltonian structure is

$$\begin{aligned}
&p = 0: && A_\perp^4, A_\perp^3\partial_\perp, A_\perp^2\partial_\perp^2, m^2A_\perp^2\\
&p = 1: && \frac{1}{\partial^+}(\xi\xi^\dagger)(A_\perp^2, A_\perp\partial_\perp, \partial_\perp^2, mA_\perp, m\partial_\perp, m^2)\,,\\
&p = 2: && \left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right)^2(\xi\xi^\dagger)^2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Physically, the terms that are proportional to the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ correspond to the elimination of the dependent variables ψ_- and A^-. Specifying the precise way in which $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ acts, we can enumerate those terms which obey the canonical rules:

$$\begin{aligned}
&p = 0: && (A_\perp)^4, (A_\perp)^3\partial_\perp, (A_\perp)^2(\partial_\perp)^2, m^2(A_\perp)^2\,,\\
& && \qquad (A_\perp\partial^+A_\perp)\frac{1}{\partial^+}(\partial_\perp A_\perp), (A_\perp\partial^+A_\perp)\left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right)^2(A_\perp\partial^+A_\perp)\,,\\
&p = 1: && (\xi\xi^\dagger)\left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right)^2(A_\perp\partial^+A_\perp), (\xi\xi^\dagger)\frac{1}{\partial^+}(\partial_\perp A_\perp),\\
& && \qquad (m, \partial_\perp, A_\perp)\xi^\dagger\frac{1}{\partial^+}\{(m, \partial_\perp, A_\perp)\xi\}\,,\\
&p = 2: && (\xi\xi^\dagger)\left(\frac{1}{\partial^+}\right)^2(\xi\xi^\dagger)\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Comparing with the Hamiltonian derived in the last section, one sees that the free terms $m^2 A_\perp^2$ and $m\xi^\dagger \partial_\perp \frac{1}{\partial^+}\xi$ are absent. The absence of the first term is because of the presumed gauge invariance. A term like the latter does appear in the free part when ψ_- is eliminated, but it is cancelled by a similar term and leads to chiral symmetry for the light-front free Hamiltonian.

ii). *Structure of light-front divergences.* There are mainly two types of divergences in light-front field theory: ultraviolet and infrared divergences. The infrared divergences in light-front QCD arises from the elimination of the unphysical degrees of freedom. In the Hamiltonian formulation, as we have shown in the previous section, these divergences are manifested from the products of interaction Hamiltonians. Each term in the interaction Hamiltonian involves an integral over the product of three or four field operators, some of them carry high momentum and others low momentum. Power counting allows us to estimate the divergences arising from the high momentum operators after they are integrated out, and the remaining low momentum operators provide the operator structure of the corresponding counterterms.

Explicitly, let us consider some simple examples: Consider the second-order shift in the energy of a gluon coming from a two-gluon intermediate state. As candidates for H_I, we take

$$H_{I(1)} = g f^{abc} \int dz^- d^2 z_\perp \partial^i A_a^j A_b^i A_c^j \,, \tag{6.7}$$

$$H_{I(2)} = -g f^{abc} \int dz^- d^2 z_\perp \left(\frac{1}{\partial^+} \partial^i A_a^i \right) A_b^j \partial^+ A_c^j \,. \tag{6.8}$$

The field operators are separated into low-momentum parts which contain wavelets of width $\delta x_\perp$, δx^-, and high-momentum parts, which contain wavelets of width $\delta y_\perp$, δy^-.

First let us consider the ultraviolet divergences. To avoid confusion with infrared divergences, we set $\delta x^- = \delta y^-$. For a candidate H_I we choose $H_{I(1)}$. Remember that to produce an ultraviolet divergence at least two operators have to belong to the high-momentum sector. a). Consider $H_{I(1)} \approx \int dz^- d^2 z_\perp (\partial^i A^j A^i)_{(y)} A^j_{(x)}$ and the energy shift $\Delta E \approx H_{I(1)} \frac{1}{E.D} H_{I(1)}$, where $E.D$ denotes the energy denominator. $H_{I(1)}$ scales like $\frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2}$, $E.D$ produces a factor $(\delta y_\perp)^2$, while the x wavelet operators in $H_{I(1)}$ produce a factor $(\frac{\delta y_\perp}{\delta x_\perp})^2$ and there is an overall factor from the integral $(\frac{\delta x_\perp}{\delta y_\perp})^2$. Thus the scaling behavior of the energy shift is $\frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2} \times (\delta y_\perp)^2 \times \frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2} \times (\frac{\delta x_\perp}{\delta y_\perp})^2 \times (\frac{\delta y_\perp}{\delta x_\perp})^2$, that is, $\Delta E \approx \frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2}$, a quadratic ultraviolet divergence; b). Consider $H_{I(1)} \approx \int dz^- d^2 z_\perp \partial^i A^j_{(x)} (A^i A^j)_{(y)}$ and the energy shift $\Delta E \approx H_{I(1)} \frac{1}{E.D} H_{I(1)}$. The only difference from case (a) is that the x wavelet operators in $H_{I(1)}$ produce a factor $(\frac{\delta y_\perp}{\delta x_\perp})^2$. Hence the scaling behavior of the energy shift is $\frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2} \times (\delta y_\perp)^2 \times \frac{1}{(\delta y_\perp)^2} \times (\frac{\delta x_\perp}{\delta y_\perp})^2 \times (\frac{\delta y_\perp}{\delta x_\perp})^4$, that is, $\Delta E \approx \frac{1}{(\delta x_\perp)^2}$, a logarithmic ultraviolet divergence.

A complete analysis of light-front divergences and the corresponding counterterms based on light-front power counting and phase space cell approach is given in [85]. It has been found that the power counting rule for ultraviolet counterterms is the same (in $\delta x_\perp$) as for the canonical Hamiltonian that there can be at most four operators scaling as $\frac{1}{\delta x_\perp}$. Thus the ultraviolet counterterms are built out of products up to fourth order in ξ, $\xi^\dagger$, $A_\perp$, and $\partial_\perp$ but they can have a completely arbitrary longitudinal structure, except for the restriction from the power counting and the longitudinal boost invariance. As a result of the constraint, the vertex counterterms can involve *a priori* unknown functions of longitudinal variables.

Now consider infrared divergences. We set $\delta x_\perp = \delta y_\perp$. Remember that to produce an infrared divergence at least two operators have to belong to the low sector. Thus, one may take $H_{I(1)} \approx \int dz^- d^2z_\perp \partial^i A^j_{(y)} (A^i A^j)_{(x)}$, $H_{I(2)} \approx \int dz^- d^2z_\perp (\frac{1}{\partial^+} \partial^i A^i_{(y)})(A^j \partial^+ A^j)_{(x)}$. a). Consider the energy shift $\Delta E \approx H_{I(2)} \frac{1}{E.D} H_{I(2)}$. $H_{I(2)}$ scales like δy^-. The energy denominator produces a factor $\frac{1}{\delta y^-}$. Another $H_{I(2)}$ produces a factor δy^-. Thus $\Delta E \approx \delta y^-$, which results in a linear infrared divergence. b). Consider the energy shift $\Delta E \approx H_{I(2)} \frac{1}{E.D} H_{I(1)}$. Then, $H_{I(1)}$ scales like $\delta y^- \times (\frac{\delta x^-}{\delta y^-})$. The energy denominator produces a factor $\frac{1}{\delta y^-}$. $H_{I(2)}$ produces a factor δy^-. Thus $\Delta E \approx \delta x^-$, which results in a logarithmic infrared divergence.

In general, the counterterms for infrared divergences involve arbitrary numbers of quark and gluon operators. They have a complex nonlocality in the transverse variables. This is in contrast to the divergent counterterm for the canonical instantaneous four-fermion interaction which is local in the transverse direction. If we identify the counterterms arising from infrared gluons (small longitudinal momentum) as the source of transverse confinement, then the unknown nonlocal transverse behavior would have to include confining effects at large transverse separation.

One might worry that the appearance of functions of momenta in the counterterms could destroy the predictive power of the theory and lead to non-renormalizability. However, these functions are needed to restore Lorentz covariance and gauge invariance as $g \to g_s$ in a weak coupling treatment (see the discussion in the next section), and without such counterterms physical quantities will not even approach finite limits as cutoffs are removed for any coupling.

VI-2. A New Cutoff Scheme for the Light-Front Hamiltonian

The light-front infrared and ultraviolet divergences discussed above should be regularized properly in order to develop a renormalization scheme. To provide a renormalization process for a realization of nonperturbative Hamiltonian computation, we need to develop a cutoff procedure that is applicable to the Hamiltonian as a whole rather than just to order

by order perturbative calculations that we have used in the previous section. One way to accomplish this is to cut off the single particle momenta appearing in the field variables themselves. Cutoffs on the constituent momenta k^+ and $k_\perp$ are called "constituent cutoffs" [85]. The resulting cutoff boundary on each constituent's relative momenta $(k_i^+, k_{i\perp})$ is given by

$$k_{i\perp}^2 = 2\Lambda^2 \frac{k_i^+}{P_0^+}\left(1 - \frac{k_i^+}{P_0^+}\right) - m^2 \qquad \text{for} \qquad \frac{m^2}{2\Lambda^2} P_0^+ < k_i^+ < \frac{P_0^+}{2}\,, \tag{6.9}$$

and

$$k_{i\perp}^2 = \frac{\Lambda^2}{2} - m^2 \qquad \text{for} \qquad \frac{P_0^+}{2} < k_i^+\,, \tag{6.10}$$

where m is the lowest of the constituent masses. In order to define such a constituent cutoff which still limits the invariant mass of a state, however, we are forced to introduce a longitudinal momentum scale P_0^+. Dependence on this scale must also be eliminated as part of the renormalization process. Then, in a considerable range of center of mass domain ($P_\perp = 0, P^+ = \frac{P_0^+}{2}$ to $P_\perp = \frac{\Lambda}{2\sqrt{2}}$, $P^+ \geq \frac{3P_0^+}{4}$), when the above cutoff constituent appears in a state, the internal mass of the state is guaranteed to be at least Λ^2.

For future practical numerical computations, we will also provide a buffer zone outside this constituent momentum cutoff boundary extending $k_{i\perp}^2$ roughly by a factor of 2 and k_i^+ by a factor of 1/2. We can accomplish this by setting the outside of the buffer zone at

$$k_{i\perp}^2 = 4\Lambda^2 \frac{k_i^+}{P_0^+}\left(1 - \frac{k_i^+}{P_0^+}\right) - m^2 \qquad \text{for} \qquad \frac{m^2}{4\Lambda^2} P_0^+ < k_i^+ < \frac{P_0^+}{2}\,, \tag{6.11}$$

and

$$k_{i\perp}^2 = \Lambda^2 - m^2 \qquad \text{for} \qquad \frac{P_0^+}{2} < k_i^+\,. \tag{6.12}$$

The buffer zone allows the use of a smooth cutoff in order to let the interactions die gradually. The cutoff Λ eliminates both ultraviolet transverse and infrared longitudinal degrees of freedom.

Practically, the cutoff on constituents means that these cutoff boundaries are directly employed in the integrals over momenta in the momentum-space expansion of the field operators. Thus, the quark field operator is

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_\lambda \chi_\lambda \int_c \frac{dk^+ d^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3} [b_\lambda(k) e^{-ik\cdot x} + d_s^\dagger \lambda(k) e^{ik\cdot x}]\,, \tag{6.13}$$

and the gluon field operator is

$$A^i(x) = \sum_\lambda \int_c \frac{dk^+ d^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3 k^+} [\epsilon_\lambda^i a_\lambda(k) e^{-ik\cdot x} + \epsilon_\lambda^{i*} a_\lambda^\dagger(k) e^{ik\cdot x}]\,, \tag{6.14}$$

where color indices have been suppressed. If we choose sharp momentum cutoffs, the momentum integrals may be explicitly written as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_c dk^+ d^2k_\perp \equiv & \int_{k^+_{min}}^{P_0^+/2} dk^+ \int d^2k_\perp \theta(2\Lambda^2 x(1-x) - m^2 - k_\perp^2) \\ & + \int_{P_0^+/2}^{\infty} dk^+ \int d^2k_\perp \theta\Big(\frac{\Lambda^2}{2} - m^2 - k_\perp^2\Big)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

where now $k^+_{min} = \frac{m^2}{2\Lambda^2}P_0^+$. It should be noted that sometimes a sharp cutoff may cause a so-called non-analytic divergence in a practical calculation [85]. To avoid such non-analyticities in the structure of counterterms, a smooth cutoff can be introduced on the momentum integrals so that

$$\int_c dk^+ d^2k_\perp \equiv \int_0^\infty dk^+ \int d^2k_\perp \mathcal{C}\Big(\frac{k_\perp^2 + m^2}{k_\perp^2 + m^2 + 4\Lambda^2 x/(1+4x)}\Big)\,, \tag{6.16}$$

where $x = k^+/P_0^+$. $\mathcal{C}(y)$ is a cutoff function which equals 1 for $y = 0$ and decreases analytically to 0 for $y = 1$. The integration over longitudinal momentum is thus cutoff at a minimum $k^+_{\rm min} = \frac{m^2}{2\Lambda^2}P_0^+$.

VI-3. Sigma Model with and Without Zero Modes

Using the power counting argument and a cutoff scheme, we may generate a theory (even at tree level) that may have already manifested some nontrivial properties with a trivial vacuum. Here we consider again the sigma model to show such a possibility. Obviously, with a cutoff on the constituents, the zero modes are removed and the vacuum is trivial. To construct the effective Hamiltonian we can rely on power counting and locality. The Hamiltonian can generally be written as

$$P^- = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \Big[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\perp\phi\cdot\partial_\perp\phi + \partial_\perp\pi\cdot\partial_\perp\pi) + V\Big]\,. \tag{6.17}$$

Since the symmetry is broken only in the σ sector, V should be even in the π-field so that the symmetry under $\pi \to -\pi$ remains. Also, since no inverse powers of mass are allowed, we can write

$$V = \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_\pi^2\pi^2 + \lambda_1\phi^4 + \lambda_2\pi^4 + \lambda_3\phi^2\pi^2 + \lambda_4\phi^3 + \lambda_5\pi^2\phi\,. \tag{6.18}$$

On the other hand, the current operator J^μ can also be constructed by power counting. The charge Q ($= \frac{1}{2}\int dx^- d^2x_\perp J^+$) is dimensionless, which leads to the canonical dimension of J^+ being $\sim \frac{1}{x^-}\frac{1}{(x_\perp)^2}$. Meanwhile, each term in $\partial^\mu J_\mu$ ($= \frac{1}{2}(\partial^- J^+ + \partial^+ J^-) - \partial^\perp\cdot J^\perp$) should have the same dimensions, which determines the dimensions of the other components: $J^\perp \sim \frac{1}{(x_\perp)^3}$, $J^- \sim \frac{x^-}{(x_\perp)^4}$. The components of J^μ are to be constructed from the operators

π, ϕ, ∂^+, ∂^-, and $\partial^\perp$ and the constants. The constants are allowed to have the dimensions of a negative power of $x_\perp$ (as masses do) but no power of x^-. Since the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ does not appear in the canonical scalar field theory, the operator $\frac{1}{\partial^+}$ is not allowed to appear in the canonical current operator. One should also implement the symmetry that J^μ has to change sign under $\pi \to -\pi$. Then the allowed structure of the components of J^μ is

$$\begin{aligned} J^+ &= a_1\partial^+\pi + a_2(\partial^+\pi)\phi + a_3(\partial^+\phi)\pi\,, \\ J_\perp &= b_1\partial_\perp\pi + b_2(\partial_\perp\phi)\pi + b_3(\partial_\perp\pi)\phi\,, \\ J^- &= c_1\partial^-\pi + c_2(\partial^-\pi)\phi + c_3(\partial^-\phi)\pi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

Now all of the coefficients in the current and the Hamiltonian can be determined by the requirement of current conservation, $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$, and covariance. The results are:

$$\begin{aligned} &a_1 = b_1 = c_1, a_2 = -b_2 = c_2 = -a_3 = b_3 = -c_3 = 1\,, \\ &\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_3 \equiv \frac{\lambda}{4},\ \ \lambda_5 = \lambda a_1,\ \ \lambda_4 = \lambda a_1,\ \ m_\phi^2 = m_\pi^2 + 2\lambda a_1^2\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

and

$$a_1 = 0 \qquad \text{or} \qquad m_\pi = 0\,. \tag{6.21}$$

If we take $a_1 = 0$ then the potential is reduced to the canonical form, and the current is also of the canonical form. This corresponds to the full canonical theory with a symmetry preserving vacuum and a doublet in the spectrum. If we choose $m_\pi = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}(\phi^2+\pi^2)^2 + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda m_\phi^2}{2}}\ (\phi^2+\pi^2)\phi\,, \\ J^\mu &= \phi\partial^\mu\pi - \pi\partial^\mu\phi + \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi^2}{2\lambda}}\ \partial^\mu\pi\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

which is the theory with zero modes eliminated and the pion is massless; then Hamiltonian explicitly breaks the symmetry, the vacuum is trivial, and there is no longer the notion of spontaneous symmetry breaking. Current conservation is preserved and vastly reduces the number of free parameters present in the effective Hamiltonian constructed from power counting and forces the pion to remain massless. The results are the same as we have obtained by the use of the shift approach in Sec. IV. We have argued that the shift technique cannot be applied to QCD. But the above solution is purely based on light-front power counting and some symmetry consideration, and it is generic for various theories. Of course, it should be emphasized that the sigma model discussed above is only at the tree level. For QCD, one must consider radiative corrections and the subsequent renormalization effects, which are much much more difficult.

VI-4. Similarity Renormalization Scheme

Now, I am going to introduce a new renormalization procedure for a Hamiltonian formulation that was recently developed by Głazek and Wilson [83,85], which will allow us to construct an effective Hamiltonian for light-front QCD. The previous discussion shows that we can write down a light-front QCD Hamiltonian based on the power counting argument and some requirement of symmetries, with a cutoff on constituents. To begin with such a bare cutoff Hamiltonian and to approach the hadronic solution we need to develop a renormalization procedure. The renormalization should allow us to remove all cutoff dependence, yet this is only a minor requirement. The highlight of the renormalization we must develop is that it allows us to reduce the effects of relativistic momenta in an effective Hamiltonian which is dominated in weak coupling by nonrelativistic relative momenta. Then, the bound states of the effective Hamiltonian in weak coupling are pure $q\bar{q}$, pure qqq, or pure gg states, exactly as predicted in the CQM. All major effects of gluon emission and absorption — or more complex processes — are absorbed into the effective Hamiltonian for these states. Once such an effective Hamiltonian is constructed, the computation of bound states involves readily executed numerical computations.

The renormalization procedure discussed next to realize these requirements is called the similarity renormalization scheme for a Hamiltonian formulation. The basic idea is to develop a sequence of infinitesimal unitary transformations that transform the initial bare Hamiltonian H_B to an effective Hamiltonian H_σ, where σ is an arbitrarily chosen energy scale,

$$H_\sigma = S_\sigma H_B S_\sigma^\dagger \,. \tag{6.23}$$

The basic goal for the transformation S_σ is that H_σ should be in band-diagonal form relative to the scale σ, namely, the matrix elements of H_σ involving energy jumps much larger than σ (other than jumps between two large but nearby energies) will all be zero, while matrix elements involving smaller jumps or two nearby energies remain in H_σ. The similarity transformation should satisfy the condition that for $\sigma \to \infty$, $H_\sigma \to H_B$ and $S_\sigma \to 1$. The effective Hamiltonian we seek involves H_σ with σ on the order of the quark or gluon mass.

Consider an infinitesimal transformation, then Eq. (6.23) is reduced to

$$\frac{dH_\sigma}{d\sigma} = [H_\sigma, T_\sigma] \,, \tag{6.24}$$

which is subject to the boundary condition $\lim_{\sigma\to\infty} H_\sigma = H_B$. To meet our demand, we need to specify the action of T_σ. This can be done by introducing a scale σ:

$$x_{\sigma ij} = \frac{|E_i - E_j|}{E_i + E_j + \sigma} \,. \tag{6.25}$$

into a function $f_{\sigma ij} = f(x_{\sigma ij})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{3}, & f(x) = 1 & (near\ diagonal\ region); \\ \frac{1}{3} \le x \le \frac{2}{3}, & f(x)\text{drops from 1 to 0} & (transition\ region); \\ \frac{2}{3} \le x \le 1, & f(x) = 0 & (far\ off\ diagonal\ region); \end{cases} \tag{6.26}$$

where $f(x)$ is to be infinitely differentiable throughout $0 \le x \le 1$, including the transition points 1/3 and 2/3. Then we rewrite Eq. (6.23) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH_{\sigma ij}}{d\sigma} &= f_{\sigma ij}[H_{I\sigma}, T_\sigma]_{ij} + \frac{d}{d\sigma}(\ln f_{\sigma ij})H_{\sigma ij}\,, \\ T_{\sigma ij} &= \frac{1}{E_j - E_i}\left\{(1 - f_{\sigma ij})[H_{I\sigma}, T_\sigma]_{ij} - \frac{d}{d\sigma}(\ln f_{\sigma ij})H_{\sigma ij}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Since $f(x)$ vanishes when $|x| \ge 2/3$, one can see that $H_{\sigma ij}$ does indeed vanish in the far off-diagonal region which will help identify divergent terms and determine the form of counterterms necessary to remove these divergences. It also can be seen that $T_{\sigma ij}$ is zero in the near-diagonal region which means that a perturbative solution to $H_{\sigma ij}$ in terms of H^B_{Iij} will never involve vanishing energy denominators.[9]

The solution for $H_{I\sigma}$ and T_σ are

$$H_{I\sigma} = H^B_{I\sigma} + \underbrace{[H_{I\sigma'}, T_{\sigma'}]}_R\,, \qquad T_\sigma = H^B_{I\sigma T} + \underbrace{[H_{I\sigma'}, T_{\sigma'}]}_T\,, \tag{6.28}$$

where $H^B_{I\sigma ij} = f_{\sigma ij}H^B_{Iij}$ and the linear operation R is

$$\underbrace{X_{\sigma' ij}}_R = -f_{\sigma ij}\int_\sigma^\infty d\sigma' X_{\sigma' ij}\,, \tag{6.29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H^B_{I\sigma Tij} &= -\frac{1}{E_j - E_i}\left(\frac{d}{d\sigma}f_{\sigma ij}\right)H^B_{Iij}\,, \\ \underbrace{X_{\sigma' ij}}_T &= -\frac{1}{E_j - E_i}\left(\frac{d}{d\sigma}f_{\sigma ij}\right)\int_\sigma^\infty d\sigma' X_{\sigma' ij} + \frac{1}{E_j - E_i}(1 - f_{\sigma ij})X_{\sigma ij}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

Finally, one can obtain an iterated solution for $H_{I\sigma}$ where all higher order terms have the substitution $\underbrace{\cdots}_{R\to T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{I\sigma} \;=\; & H^B_{I\sigma} + \underbrace{[H^B_{I\sigma'}, H^B_{I\sigma' T}]}_R \\ & + \underbrace{[\underbrace{[H^B_{I\sigma''}, H^B_{I\sigma'' T}]}_{R'}, H^B_{I\sigma' T}]}_R \\ & + \underbrace{[H^B_{I\sigma'}, \underbrace{[H^B_{I\sigma'}, H^B_{I\sigma'' T}]}_{T'}\,]}_R + \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

[9] As we know, a vanishing energy denominator in the old-fashioned Hamiltonian perturbative calculations is a potential source of large errors in other perturbative renormalization schemes.

The counterterms in H_I^B must be chosen to cancel the divergences which occur in integrals over intermediate states at higher orders in H_I^B, and such counterterms must also then be included in higher-order iterations. If a limit to this process exists the Hamiltonian is said to be renormalizable. Now we see that the effective hamiltonian H_σ causes transitions only between states staying "close to the diagonal" due to the factor $f_{\sigma ij}$, and the effects of transitions to and from intermediate states which are "far off-diagonal" have explicitly appeared in the effective Hamiltonian H_σ as a perturbative expansion.

Thus, using the similarity renormalization scheme, one transforms the Hamiltonian H_B into a manageable, band-diagonal form H_σ. H_B is the bare cutoff Hamiltonian, forced to be finite by the imposition of some cutoff Λ. After we determine the form of the counterterms and include them in H_B, each of the matrix elements of the transformed Hamiltonian $H_{\sigma ij}$ has no large dependence on Λ. Thus as we send $\Lambda \to \infty$, we get a renormalized, scale-dependent effective Hamiltonian H_σ^R. This does not finish the renormalization of the Hamiltonian, however, for the finite parts of the counterterms in H_B will produce in H_σ^R unknown constants and functions of momenta which must be adjusted to reproduce physical observables and to restore the symmetries which were broken by the cutoff Λ. These quantities are to be fixed by solving H_σ^R; one should be able to do this with a combination of few-body Hamiltonian methods and weak-coupling diagrams.

One can use the similarity transformation to bring the effective Hamiltonian to any scale σ_n and obtain a set of sequences $\{H_n^N\}$. As we change σ we change the characteristic scale, but the physics is invariant with respect to this change for large enough Λ_N. The utility of the similarity renormalization scheme is that the transformation is invertible. Thus, if one finds a Hamiltonian that is finite and Λ-independent for any one scale σ_n, the differential similarity framework guarantees that one can obtain a Hamiltonian that is finite and cutoff independent for all σ. Note that we require that each matrix element of H_σ be cutoff independent for external momenta which are small in comparison to the cutoff, which is more restrictive than just requiring this of the eigenvalues of H_σ.

VII. A WEAK COUPLING TREATMENT OF NONPERTURBATIVE QCD

In this section, I will discuss a new approach to QCD that was recently proposed based on the theoretically successful approach to bound states of QED and the phenomenologically successful approach of the CQM [85]. The basic question we try to answer is whether we can set up QCD to be renormalized and solved by the same techniques that solve QED: namely, a combination of weak-coupling perturbation theory and many-body quantum mechanics, from which we can, at least, reproduce the phenomenological success of CQM for hadrons. The renormalization scheme discussed in the last section may provide us with a practical framework to apply these two approaches together to QCD on the light-front.

To develop such a framework, one needs to change from the standard approach in QED by: a) the use of light-front dynamics; b) the use of nonzero masses for both quarks and gluons; c) the need to handle relativistic effects which give rise to, for example, asymptotic freedom in QCD, which in turn leads to a fairly strong renormalized coupling constant and hence relativistic binding energies; d) the presence of artificial stabilizing and confining potentials which vanish at relativistic values of the coupling constant but nowhere else; and e) the suitable treatment of light-front longitudinal infrared divergences, which cancel perturbatively in light-front QED because of gauge invariance, and which is the path for seeking the source of artificial potentials in light-front QCD.

The formulation starts with nonzero masses for both quarks and gluons from which one can consider an arbitrary coupling constant g which is small even at the quark-gluon mass scale. In the beginning, this will sacrifice manifest gauge invariance and Lorentz covariance. These symmetries are only implicitly restored (if at all) when the renormalized coupling is increased to its relativistic value, which we call g_s. The value g_s is a fixed number measured at the hadron mass scale. For smaller values of g the formulation lacks full covariance and is not expected to have the predictive power of QCD, but it allows phenomenology to guide renormalization and is defined to maximize the ease of perturbative computations and extrapolation to g_s. The nontrivial QCD structures arise from non-cancelling divergences in the new framework, which are necessarily the sources of true confining potentials and chiral symmetry breaking in QCD. With the cutoff Hamiltonian one can have a trivial vacuum. We expect light-front infrared divergences to be sources of confinement and chiral symmetry breaking because these are both vacuum effects in QCD and vacuum effects can enter the light-front theory through light-front longitudinal infrared effects, as we have explored in the previous sections. Because of the unconventional scaling properties of the light-front Hamiltonian, these effects include renormalization counterterms with whole functions to be determined by the renormalization process.

The basic motivation of the approach is physical rather than mathematical. Physically, a Hamiltonian with nonzero (constituent) quark and gluon masses and confining potentials is closer to the physics of strong interactions than a Hamiltonian with zero mass constituents and no confining potentials. Then, in the spirit of QED, renormalization effects analyzed with the confining potential itself can be treated perturbatively, but only for generating an effective few-body Hamiltonian which can be solved nonperturbatively. In this section, I will discuss the scheme of how to address these arguments. For a detailed derivation, please look at our recently published paper [85].

VII-1. Bare Cutoff Hamiltonian with Artificial Interactions

We begin with a bare cutoff light-front QCD Hamiltonian in which the quark and

gluon are massive constituents,

$$H'_B(\Lambda) = \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \frac{1}{2}\Big\{\partial^i A^j_a \partial^i A^j_a + m_G^2 A^{i2}_a + \varphi^\dagger\Big(\frac{-\nabla^2 + m_F^2}{i\partial^+}\Big)\varphi\Big\} + H^B_{I1}\,, \qquad (7.1)$$

where H^B_{I1} is the interaction part of the canonical light-front QCD Hamiltonian given in Sec. V, the only difference with the superscript B is that all constituent field operators are imposed by a cutoff of Eq. (6.13) or (6.14) on their momentum expansion.

The choice of light-front dynamics, massive quarks and gluons, and a particular cutoff scheme eliminates the traditional barriers to a weak-coupling treatment of QCD and allows us to begin with a trivial vacuum. In the equal-time theory, the QCD vacuum is thought to be a complicated medium which presumably provides both confinement and the spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry. Here the vacuum is trivial so we have to find other sources for confinement and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in the cutoff theory. In the bare cutoff canonical Hamiltonian, one particular term of interest is the instantaneous interaction in the longitudinal direction between color charge densities, which provides a potential which is linear in the longitudinal separation between two constituents that have the same transverse positions (see the canonical light-front QCD Hamiltonian in Sec. V). In the absence of a gluon mass term, this interaction is precisely cancelled by the emission and absorption of longitudinal gluons [82].

The presence of a gluon mass term automatically prevents unbounded growth of the running coupling constant below the gluon mass scale and provides kinematic barriers to unlimited gluon emission. It eliminates any equal-time type infrared problems. The cutoff procedure on constituents for the Hamiltonian developed before is valid also only with nonzero quark and gluon masses in a specific frame, while a large number of states (the upper limit of their invariant masses is guaranteed to be above a large cutoff) are still available for study even in the boosted frames (see the discussion on the cutoff scheme in the last section). However, the nonzero gluon mass results in the cancellation of the linear longitudinal interaction being incomplete. The canonical Hamiltonian combined with a one-gluon exchange term (in momentum space) is (see Fig. 8):

FIG. 8. The x^+-ordered $q\overline{q}$ interaction via one-gluon exchange.

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{(2)}_{Iij} = \; & -4g^2 T^a_{\alpha_3\alpha_1} T^a_{\alpha_4\alpha_2} \delta_{s_1 s_3} \delta_{s_2 s_4} \frac{1}{(p_1^+ - p_3^+)^2} - g^2 T^a_{\alpha_3\alpha_1} T^a_{\alpha_4\alpha_2} \mathcal{M}_{2ij} \frac{1}{p_1^+ - p_3^+} \\
& \times \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\frac{m_F^2 + p_{1\perp}^2}{p_1^+} - \frac{m_F^2 + p_{3\perp}^2}{p_3^+} - \frac{(p_{1\perp} - p_{3\perp})^2 + m_G^2}{p_1^+ - p_3^+}} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{\frac{m_F^2 + p_{4\perp}^2}{p_4^+} - \frac{m_F^2 + p_{2\perp}^2}{p_2^+} - \frac{(p_{1\perp} - p_{3\perp})^2 + m_G^2}{p_1^+ - p_3^+}} \right] ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.2}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{2ij} = \; & \chi^\dagger_{s_3} \left[2 \frac{p_1^{i_1} - p_3^{i_1}}{p_1^+ - p_3^+} - i m_F \left(\frac{1}{p_1^+} - \frac{1}{p_3^+} \right) \sigma^{i_1} \right. \\
& \left. - \left(\sigma^{i_1} \frac{\sigma_\perp \cdot p_{1\perp}}{p_1^+} + \frac{\sigma_\perp \cdot p_{3\perp}}{p_3^+} \sigma^{i_1} \right) \right] \chi_{s_1} , \\
& \chi^\dagger_{-s_2} \left[2 \frac{p_1^{i_1} - p_3^{i_1}}{p_1^+ - p_3^+} - i m_F \left(\frac{1}{p_4^+} - \frac{1}{p_2^+} \right) \sigma^{i_1} \right. \\
& \left. - \left(\sigma^{i_1} \frac{\sigma_\perp \cdot p_{4\perp}}{p_4^+} + \frac{\sigma_\perp \cdot p_{2\perp}}{p_2^+} \sigma^{i_1} \right) \right] \chi_{-s_4} ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.3}
$$

from which one can find an additional linear interaction due to the nonzero gluon mass, which is proportional to

$$
g^2 T^a T^a \frac{1}{(p_1^+ - p_3^+)^2} \frac{m_G^2}{m_G^2 + (p_{1\perp} - p_{2\perp})^2} . \tag{7.4}
$$

Yet, this interaction falls off too rapidly in the transverse direction, but is too strong in the longitudinal direction, which leads to an instability even at weak-coupling. To remove the above instabilities in hadronic bound states, we need to subtract this linear interaction,

$$
\frac{g^2}{4} \int d^2 x_\perp dx^- dy^- j_a^+(x^-, x_\perp) |x^- - y^-| j_a^+(y^-, x_\perp) , \tag{7.5}
$$

from the bare cutoff hamiltonian.

The cutoffs will violate Lorentz and gauge symmetries, forcing the bare Hamiltonian to contain a larger than normal set of counterterms to ensure a finite limit as the cutoffs are removed. Of special interest are counterterms that reflect consequences of zero modes (namely, modes with $k^+ = 0$), and thereby the effect of confinement and chiral symmetry breaking in the full theory. According to power-counting arguments, the counterterms for longitudinal light-front infrared divergences may contain functions of transverse momenta; there exists the possibility that the *a priori* unknown functions in the finite parts of these counterterms will include confining interactions in the transverse direction. The $g \to g_s$ limit may then be smooth if such confining functions are actually required to restore full covariance to the theory.

The task of solving the light-front Hamiltonian at the relativistic value of g is far too difficult to attempt at the present time. Instead, it may be helpful to define a plausible sequence of simpler computations that can build a knowledge base which enables studies of the full light-front Hamiltonian to be fruitful at some future date. A crucial step in simplifying the computation is the introduction of artificial potentials in the Hamiltonian.

The basic need is to incorporate the qualitative phenomenology of QCD bound states into the artificial potential. This qualitative phenomenology comes from three sources: kinetic energy, Coulomb-like potentials, and linear potentials. Three terms should be present in the weak-coupling Hamiltonian and all should have the same overall scaling behavior with g in bound state computations, namely g^4, just as QED bound state energies scale as e^4. The Coulomb-like terms can be constructed directly from Eq. (7.2). By taking a nonrelativistic limit, the above effective interaction in the $q\bar{q}$ sector due to *massless* one-gluon exchange is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{Iij}^{(2)NR} = \; & -4g^2 T^a T^a \frac{1}{2}\Big[\Big(\frac{m_F}{p_1^+}\Big)^2 \frac{1}{(p_{1\perp}-p_{3\perp})^2+(\frac{m_F}{p_1^+})^2(p_1^+-p_3^+)^2} \\ & +\Big(\frac{m_F}{p_2^+}\Big)^2 \frac{1}{(p_{2\perp}-p_{4\perp})^2+(\frac{m_F}{p_2^+})^2(p_2^+-p_4^+)^2}\Big] .\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

By using an interpolating Fourier transformation,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\frac{m_F}{p_1^+}\Big)^2 \frac{1}{(p_{1\perp}-p_{3\perp})^2+(\frac{m_F}{p_1^+})^2(p_1^+-p_3^+)^2} \\ &\quad\longrightarrow \frac{1}{4\pi}\int dy^- d^2y_\perp e^{i\{(p_1^+-p_3^+)y^- -(p_{1\perp}-p_{3\perp})\cdot y_\perp\}} \frac{m_F}{p_1^+} 1\sqrt{y_\perp^2+(\frac{p_1^+}{m_F})^2(y^-)^2}\;,\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

$\mathcal{H}_2^{NR}$ can further be expressed in position space with longitudinal boost invariance:

$$\mathcal{V}_C = g^2\frac{1}{2}\Big[\frac{m_{1c}}{p_1^+ r_1}+\frac{m_{2c}}{p_2^+ r_2}\Big] . \tag{7.8}$$

This is the light-front Coulomb potential, where r is defined as

$$r = \sqrt{\frac{(p^+\delta x^-)^2}{m_c^2}+\delta x_\perp^2}\;, \tag{7.9}$$

δx^- is the light-front longitudinal separation of two constituents, $\delta x_\perp$ the transverse separation, m_c the constituent mass, and p^+ the constituent longitudinal momentum. The p^+/m_c in the definition of r ensures that the dimensions match. Of course, the positive or negative $SU(3)$ charges must also be inserted. It is easy to check that the light-front radial coordinate is invariant under longitudinal boosts. However, it is not invariant under transverse boosts. Relativistically, the spinor matrix elements are different in different helicity sectors. In the nonrelativistic limit this helicity dependence vanishes and we get the

same interaction in all helicity sectors. In practical calculation, these helicity dependent interactions in Eq. (7.2) must also be included.

Finally, we need a linear potential term that is proportional to r and r'. In Coulomb bound states both are of order $1/g^2$. Hence, to achieve an energy of order g^4, the linear potential must have a coefficient of order g^6. Thus the linear potential term, in position space, would be proportional to $g^6 r$. To be precise and get the dimensions straight, its form is

$$\mathcal{V}_L = g^6\beta\Big[\frac{m_c^3 r}{p^+} + \frac{m_c'^3 r'}{p'^+}\Big], \tag{7.10}$$

with β a numerical constant.

The linear potential needs to exist between all possible pairs of constituents: qq, $q\bar{q}$, $\bar{q}\bar{q}$, qg, $\bar{q}g$, and gg, where q, $\bar{q}$ and g stand for quark, antiquark and gluon respectively. The linear potential must always be positive (confining) rather than negative (destabilizing). It cannot involve products of $SU(3)$ charges as the Coulomb term does. The Coulomb term could be given a Yukawa structure rather than the pure g^2/r term due to the nonzero gluon mass. All of the potential have to be Fourier transformed to momentum space and then be restricted to the allowed range of both longitudinal and transverse momenta after all cutoffs have been imposed.

A primary rule for the artificial potential is that it should vanish in the relativistic limit. For example, the artificial potential might have an overall factor $(1 - g^2/g_s^2)$ to ensure its vanishing at $g = g_s$. This rule leaves total flexibility in the choice of the artificial potential since no relativistic physics is affected by it. To ensure that the artificial potential vanishes at g_s without destroying its weak-coupling features, the subtraction term, Eq. (7.5), of the longitudinal linear potential has to be treated with care. It is suggested that the subtracted linear potential be multiplied by $(1-g^6/g_s^6)$ so that the subtraction begins to be negated only in order g^8, which is smaller for small g than the artificial g^6 linear potential that needs to be dominant. All other terms in the artificial potential can be multiplied by $(1 - g^2/g_s^2)$ instead. To ensure that the Coulomb term shows Coulomb behavior, at least roughly, at typical bound state sizes, it is important that the mass used in any Yukawa-type modification of the Coulomb term scale as g^2 rather than being a constant mass.

The artificial potential is to give the weak-coupling theory a structure close to the CQM so that past experience with the quark model can be used to determine the precise form of this potential and to fit it to experimental data. Thus, an initial calculation involves QCD complications only in a very minimal form. The artificial potential is also to incorporate a linear potential in both the longitudinal and transverse directions to ensure quark confinement for any g. This is important for phenomenology.

It is necessary to study where the artificial linear potential might originate from the counterterms of infrared divergences, and, especially in the relativistic limit, where

the artificial potential vanishes. The light-front infrared singularities give rise to both linear and logarithmic divergences. The linear divergences, however, contain the inverse of the longitudinal cutoff $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, which violates longitudinal boost invariance; hence, only the logarithmic infrared divergences can be the source of the linear confinement interaction. We expect that the logarithmic infrared divergences could occur in the g^4-order correction to Fig. 8, from which the counterterms might determine the structure of such linear potentials. But so far this calculation has not been completed.

Now, we add the artificial potential to the cutoff canonical Hamiltonian.

$$\begin{aligned} H_B(\Lambda) = \; & \int dx^- d^2x_\perp \frac{1}{2}\Big\{\partial^i A_a^j \partial^i A_a^j + m_G^2 A_a^{i2} + \varphi^\dagger\Big(\frac{-\nabla^2 + m_F^2}{i\partial^+}\Big)\varphi\Big\} \\ & + H_{I1}^B + H_{I2}^B \,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{I2}^B = \; & \Big(1 - \frac{g^2}{g_s^2}\Big)\int dx^- d^2x_\perp dy^- d^2y_\perp \\ & \cdot\Big\{-\frac{1}{4\pi} j_a^+(x)\mathcal{V}_C(x,y) j_a^+(y) + j^+(x)\mathcal{V}_L(x,y)j^+(y)\Big\} \\ & \cdot\frac{g^2}{4}\Big(1 - \frac{g^6}{g_s^6}\Big)\int dx^- d^2x_\perp dy^- j_a^+(x^-, x_\perp)|x^- - y^-| j_a^+(y^-, x_\perp)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

j_a^+ is the color vector charge density and j^+ the color singlet charge density. This starting bare cutoff Hamiltonian will allow us to determines an effective Hamiltonian via the similarity renormalization scheme.

VII-2. Effective Light-Front QCD Hamiltonian and Bound State computations

In this subsection we outline the construction of the effective light-front QCD Hamiltonian for low-energy hadrons, and discuss the increasing levels of complexity in the light-front QCD bound state computations in this formulation.

In the similarity renormalization scheme, the effective light-front QCD Hamiltonian that will be used to compute the hadronic bound states is

$$H_{\sigma ij} = \lim_{\Lambda\to\infty} f_{\sigma ij}\Big[H_{ij}^B + \sum_k \frac{1}{2} H_{Iik}^B H_{Ikj}^B \Big(\frac{g_{\sigma ijk}}{P_j^- - P_k^-} + \frac{g_{\sigma jik}}{P_i^- - P_k^-}\Big) + \cdots\Big]. \tag{7.13}$$

Here the bare cutoff Hamiltonian is divided as $H_B = H_0^B + H_I^B$. For the determination of the effective Hamiltonian H_σ, the unperturbed part of the bare Hamiltonian H_0^B is chosen to be that of free massive quarks and gluons with the standard relativistic dispersion relation in light-front kinematics. The interaction part H_I^B then contains the canonical interaction terms H_{I1}^B, the artificial potential H_{I2}^B plus a complete set of counterterms. Recall that H_{ij}^B

has the cutoff Λ which violates both longitudinal and transverse boost invariance. First one needs to identify the counterterms that must be included in H^B so that the matrix elements of the effective Hamiltonian $H_{\sigma ij}$ have no divergent dependence on Λ. Then one can send $\Lambda \to \infty$ so that the cutoff dependence is removed from the effective Hamiltonian H_σ. As in standard perturbative renormalization theory, Λ dependence will be removed order by order in g_σ, where g_σ is the running coupling constant at the similarity scale in the Hamiltonian matrix elements. This avoids having to solve the nonperturbative bound state problem in order to identify and remove the Λ dependence.

Consider the effective Hamiltonian H_σ generated to second order in the renormalized coupling constant. The counterterms H_B^{CT} up to this order contain i). the counterterms for the canonical instantaneous interactions, which are

$$H_{B2}^{CT} = -\frac{g^2}{4\pi\epsilon}\int d^2x_\perp \left(\int dx^- j^{+a}(x^-, x_\perp)\right)^2, \tag{7.14}$$

and ii). the counterterms from one-gluon exchange given in momentum space, plus a similar term in the gluon-gluon sector. There are also quark and gluon mass counterterms, some of which have given explicitly in [85]. The effect of these counterterms is to completely cancel the leading radiative corrections from instantaneous gluon exchange.

There is a question whether $H_{\sigma ij}$ satisfies boost invariance after $\Lambda \to \infty$. There can be finite terms in H_σ which violate boost invariance yet cannot justifiably be subtracted. In this case violations of boost invariance can only disappear at special values of g where the coefficient of the boost violating terms vanishes. Clearly, one such special value has to be $g = g_s$, as part of the restoration of covariance at g_s. In the following it is assumed that the effective Hamiltonian H_σ has boost invariance simply as a result of taking the $\Lambda \to \infty$ limit. H_σ is generated as the first step in solving the bare cutoff Hamiltonian H_B.

The second step is to construct bound states from H_σ, which are determined by the bound state equation of Eq. (4.11) with H_σ as the Hamiltonian. One can solve this field theoretic bound state problem in the standard fashion, using the bound state approach of QED. This requires us to identify a part of H_σ, $H_{\sigma 0}$, which is treated nonperturbatively to produce bound states. The essential simplification that makes further calculation possible is that $H_{\sigma 0}$ does not contain any interactions that change particle number, so that the methods of few-body quantum mechanics can be used to solve this initial nonperturbative problem. All field theoretic corrections the interaction part of the effective Hamiltonian that arise from particle creation and annihilation will then be treated perturbatively, as in QED.

Now, one might ask, what is the dependence of this effective Hamiltonian H_σ on the scale σ and what is the physical consequence of the scale dependence? Suppose we restrict the states to only a $q\bar{q}$ pair. Then only number conserving (potential-like) terms

in H_σ contribute. Now, if we let the scale σ approach a very large number, only the original interactions in H_B survive since the factor $(1 - f_{\sigma ik} f_{\sigma jk}) \to 0$. Thus the canonical four-fermion interaction together with all counterterms survive, whereas the transversely smeared four-fermion interaction diminishes in strength. In the limit $\sigma \to \infty$ we are recovering H_B, which is no surprise. In this limit the effects of higher Fock sectors (for example $q\bar{q}g$) can be recovered only by including them explicitly, and so it clearly becomes a poor approximation to include only the $q\bar{q}$ sector when σ becomes too large.

By lowering the similarity scale σ, we reduce the allowed range of gluon momenta which can contribute, for example, to the binding of a quark and antiquark in a meson. These effects must appear elsewhere; we see that, through the similarity transformation, they are added directly to the Hamiltonian via the second and higher order terms in H_B. Thus, by lowering σ, we put the bare gluon exchange effects of H_B into a $q\bar{q}$ potential in the effective Hamiltonian H_σ perturbatively. This clearly changes the character of the bound state calculation. It changes from a field theoretic computation with arbitrary numbers of constituents to a computation dominated by an effective $q\bar{q}$ potential. If we choose the similarity scale σ to be just above the hadronic mass scale the major effects come from the $q\bar{q}$ sector. The resulting nonrelativistic calculation will not see the scale σ in the first approximation, since only states close to the diagonal, for which $f_{\sigma ij} = 1$, will contribute. This can be outlined with the following schematic equation:

$$\begin{aligned} H^R_{QCD} &= H^R_0(g_s) + H^R_I(g_s) \\ &= \{H^R_0(g_s) + H^R_{artificial}(g_s)\} + \{H^R_I(g_s) - H^R_{artificial}(g_s)\} \\ &\equiv H_{\sigma 0}(g) + H_{\sigma I}(g)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

Equivalently, $H_{\sigma 0}(g) = H^R_0(\sigma, g_\sigma) + (1 - g^2_\sigma/g^2_s) H^R_{artificial}(\sigma, g_\sigma)$ and $H_{\sigma I}(g) = H^R_I(\sigma, g_\sigma)$.

A basic goal of this approach is to construct a sequence of computations in light-front QCD with growing levels of complexity. The major sources of the complexity are analyzed in [85]. The further computations are i). an initial nonperturbative calculation of the hadronic masses to determine the parameters in $H_{\sigma 0}$ in the hadronic scale with the binding energies up to the fourth order of the coupling constant. This is a straightforward calculation; ii). the next, the leading radiative correction to these masses, which requires a calculation of the effective Hamiltonian up to g^4 and the binding energies up to g^6, in which logarithmic infrared divergences should occur and the transverse linear potentials as the counterterms of these divergences could be justified; iii) the extensions to the perturbative theory to study the strong coupling structure of the bound states which will be the real challenge to this approach.

Practically, even if we are successful in finding the light-front hadronic bound states in this direction, the theory is still not completely established. We have seen in Sec. III

that the matrix elements associated with various hadronic structures are defined on the *canonical* light-front field operators in the light-front bound states. Since the bound states obtained in the above approach come from the use of the light-front effective QCD Hamiltonian that contains many nontrivial counterterms for the severe light-front divergences that are allowed by the light-front power counting. Thus the matrix elements in terms of the canonical light-front field operators may not provide the correct physical information of hadrons due to the fact that many light-front physical operators associated with the observables are also dynamically dependent. Typical examples are the transverse and longitudinal components of currents that have "bad" components ψ_- of fermions, and the operators in the hadronic structure function that belong to the high-twist contributions [94]. Therefore renormalization which introduces many noncanonical counterterms to the light-front Hamiltonian must also change the canonical structure of the operators used in the structure function definition. Obviously, the renormalization of physical operators besides the light-front Hamiltonian is another essential problem in the investigations of the light-front QCD bound states which has yet to be developed [156].

VIII. A BRIEF SUMMARY

In this article, I have reviewed the basic formulation of the light-front field theory, the light-front expression of various strong interaction phenomena measured or extracted from various high energy experiments, and the possible understanding of these phenomena from QCD on the light-front. The essential problem for solving QCD on the light-front is to find the light-front hadronic bound states, since most of the interesting hadronic quantities, such as the parton distribution functions, parton fragmentation functions, hadronic form factors and coupling constants can naturally be formulated on the light-front in terms of simple matrix elements of light-front field operators in light-front hadronic bound states. Light-front field theory gives us a simple Schrödinger picture of bound state equations for relativistic particles, in which the bound states are simply a Fock states expansion on the trivial light-front vacuum. With such a picture, we may develop a reliable approach for addressing the relativistic bound states, as well as nonperturbative field theory for QCD. The main problem in this framework is reduced then, to constructing an effective QCD Hamiltonian on the light-front with a trivial vacuum so that it can reproduce the well-known phenomenology of hadrons on the low energy scale and can deduce perturbative QCD with asymptotic freedom at the high energy scale. A schematic approach to solving this problem has been discussed; further applications need to be explored.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to H. Y. Cheng, C. Y. Cheung, S. C. Lee, S. P. Li, G. L. Lin, H. L. Yu, M. C. Huang and C. L. Wu for many useful discussions. The author also thanks H. Y. Cheng for giving him the opportunity to present the lectures on this subject at "the Second Workshop on Particle Physics Phenomenology" held in Kenting National Park, and to S. C. Lee for support through the National Science Council Grant: NSC83-0208-M-001-069.

APPENDIX A: TWO-COMPONENT FEYNMAN PERTURBATIVE THEORY

For most field theorists Feynman's formulation is more convenient. In this appendix, I present the two-component light-front QCD Feynman theory. The two-component light-front QCD Lagrangian has a canonical form,

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{int}\,, \tag{A1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu A^i_a \partial^\mu A^i_a - \xi^\dagger\left(\frac{1}{i\partial^+}\right)(\Box^2 + m^2)\xi\,, \\ \mathcal{L}_{int} &= -\mathcal{H}_{int}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

The Feynman rules can be derived from the path integral formalism [158]. Here we use the procedure of 't Hooft and Veltman [159]. The result follows. The free quark and gluon propagators in two-component light-front QCD are

$$S_{0\alpha\beta}(p) = \frac{ip^+\delta_{\alpha\beta}}{p^2 - m^2}\,, \qquad D^{ij}_{0ab} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ab}\frac{i}{k^2}\,. \tag{A3}$$

The diagrammatic rules for various vertices are listed in Table III. The rest of the Feynman rules are the same as in the instant-form for boson and fermion theories. With these basic ingredients, the conventional Feynman approach to various physical processes can be directly discussed within the above two-component formulation of light-front QCD.

It may be worth mentioning that one advantage of the two-component Feynman perturbation theory is that we can use the ML prescription and dimensional regulator to regulate the light-front infrared divergences and ultraviolet divergences in Feynman loop integrals, and may recover the multiplicative renormalizability of the theory, at least in the one-loop approximation, as shown in Ref. [60].

TABLE III. Two-component Feynman Diagrammatic Rules

REFERENCES

[1] For an extensive list of the reference, on light-front dynamics, see "Sources for Light-front Physics" available via anonymous FTP from pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu in the subdirectory pub/infolight.

[2] P. A. M. Dirac, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 392 (1949).

[3] S. Tomonoga, Prog. Theor. Phys. **1**, 27 (1946).

[4] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **74**, 1439 (1948); **75**, 651; **76**, 790 (1949).

[5] R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **76**, 769 (1949).

[6] F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. **75**, 486; 1736 (1949).

[7] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **150**, 1313 (1966).

[8] S. Fubini and G, Furlan, Physics **1**, 229 (1965).

[9] R. Dashen and M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 340 (1966).

[10] R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 1415 (1969).

[11] R. P. Feynman, *Photon-hadron interactions*, Benjamin, Reading, Massachusetts (1972).

[12] J. D. Bjorken and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. **185**, 1975 (1969).

[13] D. J. Gross and S. Treiman, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 1059 (1971).

[14] S. D. Drell, D. J. Levy, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **181**, 2159 (1969).

[15] S. D. Drell, D. J. Levy, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 1035 (1970).

[16] S. D. Drell, D. J. Levy, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 1617 (1970).

[17] J. D. Bjorken, J. B. Kogut, and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. **D3**, 1382 (1971).

[18] see an early review by J. B. Kogut and L. Susskind, Phys. Rep. **C8**, 75 (1973).

[19] S.-J. Chang and S.-K. Ma, Phys. Rev. **180**, 1506 (1969).

[20] H. Leutwyler, J. R. Klauder and L. Streit, Nuo. Cim. Vol. **LXVIA**, No. 3 (1970).

[21] J. B. Kogut and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 2901 (1970).

[22] F. Rohrlich, Acta. Phys. Austr. **32**, 87 (1970).

[23] R. A. Neville and F. Rohrlich, Nov. Cim. **A1**, 625 (1971).

[24] S.-J. Chang, R. G. Root, and T.-M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1133 (1973).

[25] S.-J. Chang and T.-M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1147 (1973).

[26] T.-M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1760 (1973).

[27] T.-M. Yan, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1780 (1973).

[28] D. Flory, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 2795 (1970).

[29] L. Susskind, Phys. Rev., **165**, 1535 (1968); and in *Lectures in Theoretical Physics*, Vol. Xi-D, edited by K. T. Mahanthappa and E. E. Brittin, (Gordon and Breach Sci. Pub., New York, 1969) p. 135.

[30] J. M. Cornwell and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 367 (1971).

[31] D. A. Dicus, R. Jackiw, and V. L. Teplitz, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 1733 (1971).

[32] R. Jackiw, *Springer Tracts in Mod. Phys.* **62**, 1972.

[33] R. F. Dashen and M. Gell-Mann, in *Proc. of the 3rd Coral Gables Conf. on Symmetry Principles at High Energy*, ed. by A. Perlmutter et at. (1966).

[34] S. Fubini, Nuovo Cimento, **34A**, 475 (1966).

[35] H. Fritzsch and M. Gell-Mann, in *Proc. XVI Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics*, edited by J. D. Jackson and A. Roberts. (Fermilab, 1972) Vol. 2, p. 135.

[36] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1343 (1973).

[37] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1346 (1973).

[38] For an example, see R. L. Jaffe, in *Relativistic Dynamics and Quark-Nuclear Physics*, edited by M. B. Johnson and A. Picklesimer, (Wiley, New York, 1986), p. 537.

[39] E. Tomboulis, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 2736 (1973).

[40] J. M. Cornwell, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 1067 (1974).

[41] R. J. Crewther, *Weak and Electromagnetic interactions at high energy*, ed M. Levy et al., (Plenum, New York, 1976) p. 345.

[42] D. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 980 (1974).

[43] A. Casher, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 452 (1976).

[44] W. A. Bardeen and R. B. Pearson, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 547 (1976).

[45] W. A. Bardeen, R. B. Pearson, and E. Rabinovici, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 1037 (1980).

[46] C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. **D19**, 639; **D20**, 1934 (1979).

[47] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2157 (1980).

[48] G. P. Lepage, S. J. Brodsky, T. Huang, and P. B. Mackenzie, in *Particles and Fields 2*, edited by A. Z. Capri and A. N. Kamal (Plenum, New York, 1983).

[49] S. J. Brodsky and G. P. Lepage, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics* ed. A. H. Mueller, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).

[50] V. A. Franke, Y. V. Novozhilov, and E. V. Prokhvatilov, Lett. Math. Phys. **5**, 239; 437 (1981).

[51] St. D. Głazek, Phys. Rev. **D38**, 3277 (1988).

[52] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. **B126**, 298 (1977).

[53] G. Curci, W. Furmanski, and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. **B175**, 27 (1980).

[54] R. K. Ellis, W. Furmanski and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. **B207**, 1 (1982).

[55] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. Sterman, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics* ed. A. H. Mueller, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).

[56] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **179**, 1499 (1969).

[57] S. Mandelstam, Nucl. Phys. **B213**, 149 (1983).

[58] G. Leibbrandt, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 1699 (1984).

[59] D. M. Capper, J. J. Dulwich, and M. J. Litvak, Nucl. Phys. **B241**, (1984) 463.

[60] H. C. Lee and M. S. Milgram, Nucl. Phys. **B268**, 543 (1986).

[61] L. D. Faddeev and A. A. Slavnov, *Gauge Firlds*, (Benjamin/Cummings, reading, MAssachusetts, 1980).

[62] J. A. Dixon and J. C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. **B78**, (1974) 552.

[63] S. D. Joglekar and B. W. Lee, Ann. of Phys. **97**, 160 (1976).

[64] R. Hamberg and W. L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. **B379**, (1992) 143, and references therein.

[65] J. C. Collins and R. J. Scalise, Preprint PSU/TH/141, hep-ph/9403231 (1994).

[66] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 3432 (1976); Phys. Rep. **142**, 357 (1986).

[67] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 2455 (1974).

[68] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **140**, B445 (1965).

[69] K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **B4**, 3184 (1971).

[70] C. Rebbi, ed., *Lattice Gauge Theories and Monte Carlo Simulations*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1983).

[71] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B147**, 385 (1979).

[72] See, for example, G. T. Bodwin and D. R. Yennie, Phys. Rep. **43C**, 267 (1978).

[73] W. E. Caswell and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. **A18**, 810 (1978).

[74] J. R. Sapirstein, E. A. Terray, and D. R. Yennie, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 2990 (1984).

[75] G. T. Bodwin, D. R. Yennie, and M. A. Gregorio, Rev. Mod. Phy. **57**, 723 (1985).

[76] M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Lett. **8**, 214 (1964).

[77] G. Zweig, CERN Reports Th. 401 and 412 (1964), and in Proc. Int. School of Phys. "Ettore Majorana", Erice, Italy (1964), ed. A. Zichichi, p. 192 (Academic, New York, 1965).

[78] H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rep. **8C**, 173 (1973).

[79] O. W. Greenberg, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **28**, 327 (1978).

[80] for reviews, see: F. E. Close, *Quarks and Partons*, Academic Press, London (1979); also W. Lucha, F. F. Schöberl, and D. Gromes, Phys. Rep. **200**, 127 (1991).

[81] K. G. Wilson, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.), **B17**, 82 (1989).

[82] W. M. Zhang and A. Harindranath, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4881 (1993).

[83] St. D. Głazek and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 5863 (1993).

[84] St. D. Głazek and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4214 (1994).

[85] K. G. Wilson, T. S. Walhout, A. Harindranath, W. M. Zhang, R. J. Perry, and St. D. Głazek, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6720 (1994).

[86] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Yeshiva Univ., New York, 1964).

[87] L. D. Faddeev and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1692 (1988).

[88] W. M. Zhang and A. Harindranath, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4868 (1993).

[89] S. L. Adler and R. F. Dashen, *Current Algebra*, (Benjamin, New York, 1968).

[90] K. Baedakci and G. Segre, Phys. Rev. **153**, 1263 (1967).

[91] J. Jersak and J. Stern, Nuovo Cimento, **59**, 315 (1969).

[92] F. Feinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 540 (1973).

[93] R. Carlitz, D. Heckathorn, J. Kaur, and W. K. Tang, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 1234 (1975).

[94] R. Jaffe and X. Ji, Nucl. Phys. **B375**, 527 (1992).

[95] J. C. Collins and D. E. Soper, Nucl. Phys. **B194**, 445 (1982).

[96] R. L. Jaffe and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B412**, 79 (1994).

[97] M. Neubert, CERN-TH.7113/93, Dec. 1993.

[98] T. Maskawa and K. Yamawaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **56**, 1649 (1976).

[99] A. Harindranath and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 421 (1988).

[100] G. McCartor, Z. Phys. **C41**, 271 (1988).

[101] Th. Heinzl, St. Krusche, and E. Werner, Z. Phys. **A334**, 443 (1989).

[102] E. V. Prokhvatilov and V. A. Franke, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **49**, 688 (1989).

[103] G. McCartor, Zeit. Phys. **C52**, 611 (1991).

[104] F. Lenz, M. Thies, S. Levit, and K. Yazaki, Ann. Phys. (NY) **208**, 1 (1991).

[105] G. Robertson, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 2549 (1993).

[106] M. Burkardt, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4628 (1993).

[107] S. Huang and W. Lin, UW preprint, (submitted to Ann. Phys.).

[108] H. C. Pauli and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 1993; 2001 (1985).

[109] A. C. Tang, S. J. Brodsky, and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1842 (1991).

[110] M. Kaluza and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2968 (1992).

[111] M. Kaluza and H.-J. Pirner, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1620 (1993).

[112] R. J. Perry, A. Harindranath, and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2959 (1990).

[113] R. J. Perry and A. Harindranath, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 4051 (1991).

[114] S. Głazek, A. Harindranath, S. Pinsky, J. Shigemitsu, and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1599 (1993).

[115] A. Harindranath, J. Shigemitsu, and W. M. Zhang, "Study of Utilizing Basis Functions to Solve Simple Light-Front Equations in 3+1 Dimensions", unpublished (1993).

[116] I. Tamm. J. Phys. (USSR) **9**, 449 (1949).

[117] S. M. Dancoff, Phys. Rev. **78**, 382 (1950).

[118] G. t'Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B75**, 461 (1974).

[119] H. Bergknoff, Nucl. Phys. **B122**, 215 (1977).

[120] T. Eller, H. C. Pauli, and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D35**, 1493 (1987).

[121] A. Harindranath and J. Vary, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 1141 (1987); **D37**, 1064; 3010 (1988).

[122] M. Burkardt, Nucl. Phys. **A504**, 762 (1989).

[123] K. Hornbostel, S. J. Brodsky, and H. C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3814 (1990).

[124] St. D. Głazek and R. J. Perry, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 3740 (1992).

[125] A. Harindranath, R. J. Perry, and J. Shigemitsu, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4580 (1992).

[126] M. Burkardt, Nucl. Phys. **B373**, 613 (1992).

[127] Y. Mo and R. J. Perry, J. Comp. Phys. **108**, 159 (1993).

[128] S. Dalley and I. R. Klebanov, "String Spectrum of 1+1 Dimensional Large N QCD with Adjoint Matter", Princeton Univ. preprint PUPT-1342 (1993).

[129] M. V. Terent'ev, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 106 (1976).

[130] V. B. Berestetsky and M. V. Terent'ev, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 547 (1976); *ibid*, **25**, 347 (1977).

[131] H. J. Melosh, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 1095 (1974).

[132] E. Eichten, F. Feinberg, and J. F. Willemen, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 1204 (1973).

[133] F. Schlumpf, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4114 (1993).

[134] P. L. Chung, F. Coester, and W. N. Polyzou, Phys. Lett. **B205**, 545 (1988).

[135] P. L. Chung, F. Coester, B. D. Keister, and W. N. Polyzou, Phys. Rev. **C37**, 2000 (1988).

[136] Z. Dziembowski and J. Franklin, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 905 (1990).

[137] W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 2851 (1991).

[138] V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Nucl. Phys. **B201**, 492 (1982); Phys. Rep. **112**, 173 (1984).

[139] T. Huang, B. Q. Ma, and Q. X. Shen, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1490 (1994).

[140] V. Braun and I. Halperin, preprint, hep-ph/9402270.

[141] R. L. Jaffe and M. Soldate, Phys. Rev. **D26**, 49 (1982).

[142] D. J. Pritchard and W. J. Stirling, Nucl. Phys. **B165**, 237 (1980).

[143] For a review, see G. Leibbrandt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 1067 (1987).

[144] D. Mustaki, S. Pinsky, J. Shigemitsu, and K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3411 (1991).

[145] M. Burkardt and A. Langnau, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1187, 3857 (1991).

[146] A. Langnau and M. Burkardt, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 3452 (1993).

[147] R. J. Perry, Phys. Lett. **300B**, 8 (1993).

[148] A. Harindranath and W. M. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4903 (1993).

[149] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 402 (1963).

[150] W. M. Zhang and A. Harindranath, Phys. Lett. **314B**, 223 (1993).

[151] A. C. Tang, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 3014 (1988).

[152] K. G. Wilson, OSU internal reprot (unpublished, 1990); also see [85].

[153] J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964).

[154] W. Heitler, *The Quantum Theory of radiation*, (Oxford, Univ. Press, London, 1936).

[155] N. Christ and T. D. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 939 (1980).

[156] W. M. Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B333**, 158 (1994).

[157] I. Bars and F. Green, Nucl. Phys. **B142**, 157 (1978).

[158] E. S. Abers and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rep. **9C**, 1 (1973).

[159] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, *Diagrammar*, CERN preprint (1973).

Of An It Strictly If Since The As

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig3-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig4-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig3-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig4-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1

This figure "fig3-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9412244v1